

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN EDMUND A. MILLER, USN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard has long been a vital economic force in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area. Since August of 1975, the shipyard has grown and flourished under the supervision of Capt. Edmund A. Miller, USN, whose performance as commander of the shipyard has been the epitome of professionalism and high quality.

When Captain Miller's retirement becomes effective in September of this year, the shipyard and the harbor area community will be without his energetic leadership and the example he has set through hard work and devotion to duty. Captain Miller will be remembered for the openness and fairness he brought to his position, as well as being one of the outstanding commanders in the shipyard's 34-year history.

Born in Booneville, Miss., on August 9, 1927, Edmund A. Miller grew up in the town of West Point, Miss. He attended Marion Military Institute in Alabama, and Mississippi State University. He was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1945; graduated and received a commission as an ensign in June 1949.

After spending 5 years at sea, Captain Miller was ordered to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1954. He graduated in 1957 with a master of science degree in naval architecture and marine engineering, and a professional degree of naval engineer in naval construction.

While attending MIT, Ed—as he is known to his many friends—was elected to the honorary engineering fraternity of Tau Beta Pi and the honorary research fraternity Sigma Xi. In later years, Captain Miller received a master of science degree in administration from George Washington University.

Following his graduation from MIT, Captain Miller saw tours of duty at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard—1957-59; supervisor of shipbuilding in Pascagoula, Miss.—1959-62; aboard the U.S.S. *Amphion* (AR-13), 1962-64; staff of Commander Cruiser Destroyer Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, 1964-67; Naval Ship Systems Command, 1967-72; and staff of the Chief of Naval Operations, 1973.

Captain Miller reported to the Long Beach Naval Shipyard in August, 1973, as production officer. Two years later, in August of 1975, Capt. Edmund A. Miller became commander of Long Beach Naval Shipyard and supervisor of shipbuilding, conversion, and repair.

During his tenure as commander, Captain Miller has been instrumental in the continued growth and development of the facility. His energetic leadership and ability to inspire others to perform to the best of their abilities has led to increased nationwide awareness of the ex-

cellent reputation earned by the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

In addition, Captain Miller has been involved in community affairs. He is currently a member of the board of directors, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce; a member of the board of advisers of the School of Business and the Department of Industrial Technology at California State University, Long Beach; a member of the advisory board of the Harbor Occupational Center, Los Angeles Unified School District; and has twice served on career education policy seminars sponsored by the George Washington University Institute of Educational Leadership. Captain Miller is also an ordained deacon in the Southern Baptist Church, and has long served as a church school teacher.

His long and successful military career is reflected in his many decorations, which include the World War II Victory Medal, the European Occupational Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, the American Service Medal, the Korean Campaign Medal with one star, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his career Captain Edmund A. Miller, USN, has exemplified the qualities which make a person successful in life, both as a civilian and in the military. I would like to take this opportunity to extend by heartiest congratulations to him as he approaches the date of his retirement.

His lovely wife, Hannah, and their children, Edmund A., Jr., and Anita, must all be very proud of his outstanding career and many accomplishments.

THE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES OF NEW YORK'S PUERTO RICAN AND HISPANIC COMMUNITY: VI

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in today's RECORD another in the series of position papers that were presented at the conference on the problems of Puerto Ricans and Hispanics in the New York metropolitan area that I sponsored last month.

This paper, on the problems of the Puerto Rican and other Hispanic elderly, is particularly important because it points up that where all elderly poor are disadvantaged, the Hispanic elderly suffer greater hardships and receive fewer benefits. As this Congress reassesses its approach to social service programs over the next years, I hope that the special considerations presented in this paper will be taken into account:

THE PUERTO RICAN AND OTHER HISPANIC ELDERLY

The Puerto Rican elderly population comprises a particularly vulnerable class of needy persons within the already disadvantaged population of elderly Americans. Due to linguistic and cultural barriers, the continu-

ing breakdown in the extended family, and the disadvantages endemic to their minority group status, the Spanish-speaking elderly find themselves in even more precarious circumstances than the majority of the American elderly population.

Although the Spanish-speaking population comprises the second largest minority group in this country, small commitment, even in rhetoric, has been made to address its unique needs. Funds allotted for services to the elderly are not equitably distributed by agencies to provide for the needs of the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly. The myth of the return migration of Puerto Rican elderly has been dispelled by findings in recent surveys conducted in New York City. In so basic a benefit as Social Security, only 50% of the Hispanic elderly receive benefits compared to 75% of the remaining elderly population.

Some of the crucial factors in the lag between available services and participation by the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly are: the lack of programs to train researchers and related personnel, the paucity of Hispanic-directed agencies, and the lack of bilingual, bicultural personnel at all levels in agencies responsible for providing services to the Spanish-speaking elderly. Outreach through the use of bilingual, bicultural personnel and bilingual literature (S.S.A. or S.S.I. application forms, information and referral literature, newsletters, etc.) must be more comprehensively developed so as to insure maximum utilization of benefits and entitlements by the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly. In addition, training programs must be established for the purpose of developing skills of Hispanic senior citizens to prepare them for serving on committees, staffing centers, and assuming the strong leadership needed to reach the objective of effective outreach to, and involvement of, the Spanish-speaking community. These programs would also have a recruitment component that would enlist personnel qualified to bring existing services to the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly. Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly must be offered proper training to insure ongoing, creative and meaningful employment.

Although there are services available to the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly, they are alarmingly inadequate. Therefore, we further recommend that the federal level of S.S.I. benefits be immediately increased at a rate which catches up to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' lower level of living standard and be adjusted to the middle level as soon as possible on a regional basis. We urge the Legislature to stand firm in their conviction that when cuts are projected they not be at the expense of the level of basic income for our poorest elderly citizens. We further recommend that the full amount of federal S.S.I. cost-of-living increases be passed on to S.S.I. recipients. We strongly urge the federal government to assume the responsibility of administering the Emergency Assistance to Adults Program on a permanent basis. Programs to train bilingual, bicultural personnel and Hispanic committees should be developed to alert the Hispanic elderly of their rights and to interpret complicated welfare reforms to the Spanish-speaking community.

We recommend that Supplementary Security Income benefits be extended to all citizens, including those in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and that the existing law be so amended. Puerto Rico presently does not receive S.S.I. benefits. In addition, we further recommend the expansion of services for the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly in their homes. An extended family approach is needed and must be

initiated and implemented by personnel representative of the clients who will be served if the rights of the Hispanic elderly are to be preserved. The Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly must be apprised of the alternatives to institutionalization and how to pursue these alternatives. Again, this involves Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic persons at the policymaking level as well as at the providing level.

We recommend a universal, comprehensive health security program for all, as proposed in the Kennedy-Corman bill. Furthermore, such a program should be administered by a proportionate representation of the Hispanic elderly population. This bill represents the best of the current legislation and should be expanded. We recommend the funding and development of innovative senior centers in Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic communities under the guidance of Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly and with Boards of Directors and staff sensitive to the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic cultural heritage. Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic community persons should be given the responsibility of outreach and publicity regarding these services. Nutrition services should include such programs as home-based programs, meal-on-wheels, congregate meal programs, etc., and should reflect the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly's roots. The prevalence of the role of the "abuelita" among the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly indicates that child-care facilities must be provided in conjunction with senior centers in the Spanish-speaking communities.

To respond to the lack of information on the Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic elderly, we recommend that funds be allocated for research and for the training of Puerto Rican and Hispanic personnel to conduct this research.

To enter into the subjects of the effects of inflation on incomes of older persons, housing, transportation, security, age discrimination—all very complicated and complex issues, all affecting the life style and existence of Puerto Rican and Hispanic elderly persons—is beyond the limits of this paper. They are problems affecting all citizens and require broad, forthright city, state, and federal legislation. However, regardless of the changes made, humane and universal legislation must be developed at least in the interest of all senior citizens respecting the special needs of the Puerto Rican and Hispanic elderly.

THE PAPERWORK DISASTER

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the morass of redtape and government forms that are stifling the citizens of this country. As a former small businessman, I am all too familiar with battles being waged by honest Americans who are making every effort to comply with the rules and regulations of the U.S. Government.

When I came to Congress in 1975, I had great hopes and aspirations about cleaning-up the bureaucracy and achieving meaningful reductions in the seemingly endless number of forms and pa-

perwork generated by the Federal Government. At that time, I placed my faith in the newly created Federal Paperwork Commission and had high expectations that relief from the onerous paperwork burden being borne by the American people would soon be on the way. An editorial which recently appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar newspaper captured my sense of disappointment and the feelings of millions of people across the country. I would like to insert it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of the distinguished Members of this body:

THE PAPERWORK DISASTER

As Lewis Carroll put it, the walrus and the carpenter were walking on the beach and wept to see such quantities of sand.

The walrus, in his innocence, asked, "If seven maids with seven mops swept it for half a year, do you suppose that they could get it clear?"

The carpenter, obviously a realist, replied, "I doubt it," and shed a bitter tear.

Substitute federal government paperwork for Carroll's quantities of sand and you begin to get an idea of the utter improbability that the Federal Paperwork Commission will fulfill its mission.

The commission was set up in 1975 by former President Ford, and its aim—to cut down on paperwork, especially forms private citizens and businesses must fill out—is heartily endorsed by President Carter.

The federal bureaucracy being what it is, the commission didn't limit itself to a mere seven maids. The first thing it did was to hire 208 employees, buy three sophisticated copying machines and has now succeeded in digesting its entire \$11 million budget while producing a massive new dune of paperwork of its own to add to the mountain it's supposed to cut down to workable size.

One public member, an accountant from California who represents small businessmen, says this year and a half on the commission is "the most frustrating experience I've ever had. He's had to acquire an extra four-drawer filing cabinet just to store the paperwork generated internally by the commission."

A few months ago, the Office of Management and Budget reported that, although the number of forms citizens must fill out had dropped, the amount of paperwork had increased. At that time is required 143 million man-hours per year to do the work—13 million more than before the drive to eliminate unnecessary paperwork began. The reasons: New programs, more people in old programs and—worst of all—consolidation of some relatively simple forms into fewer but far more time-consuming longer ones.

The commission is due to go out of business in October. Based on the record to date, will it have made much of a dent in the paperwork dune? Like the carpenter, we doubt it, and join him in shedding a bitter tear about the way things are done in Washington.

SOCIAL SECURITY RIGHTS ACT

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr.

SEIBERLING, is reintroducing the Social Security Rights Act along with 49 cosponsors. As a former cosponsor in the 94th Congress, I am pleased again to be associated with this legislation.

Recently, the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Social Security circulated a questionnaire to Members and their caseworkers who deal with social security matters. In replying, my staff and I noted considerable improvement in the responsiveness of the Social Security Administration—SSA—over the past 5 years. Indeed, the actual processing of claims and the appeals process has improved over the same time period, largely due to legislation passed in December 1975.

Yet I continue to receive more legitimate complaints from constituents about social security programs—and in particular about the disability insurance program—than about any other Federal program. These concerns continue to deal with the long delays in disability claim determination; with the appeals process; and with the complicated, lengthy procedures involved in replacing missing benefit checks. Claims are still not processed promptly, often because of lack of adequate experienced and trained representatives in the district offices. In fact, in January of 1977 the median processing time was 220 days.

The Social Security Rights Act would insure that the SSA take the necessary steps to eliminate its hearing backlog—81,592 cases in January 1977—and to expedite benefit claim processing delays. It requires that initial and reconsideration decisions be made within 90 days. Hearing and appeals decisions on all social security claims must be made within 120 days. Claimants would have the right to receive benefit payments if their claims were not decided within these time limits.

The bill would enable benefit recipients to submit a request to replace a missing check if the regular payment were not received within 5 days of the regular delivery date. The SSA would be required to provide a duplicate check within 10 days or an explanation as to why the recipient is not entitled to it. This provision is directed at the often devastating effect of a lost check upon persons whose sole source of income is social security.

With increasing SSA responsibilities to administer not only social security, but supplemental security income—SSI—and now aid for families with dependent children—AFDC—Congress must not ignore the existing inadequate level of service to persons who have contributed regularly to their social insurance. This bill is well named. Americans who are eligible for social security have rights * * * and these rights are earned. I believe the Social Security Rights Act will force both the SSA and the Congress to address in a realistic manner how new programs or program revisions can be administered by the SSA. I believe enactment will go a long way toward mak-

ing the SSA work for the people it was established to serve.

SPERRY SOFTBALL LEAGUE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege on Saturday, May 21 to participate in a presentation made to the Sperry Softball League, in light of their outstanding achievement on behalf of the field of mental health and their warm and generous contribution to the Rehabilitation Institute, located in Mineola, Long Island.

In 1974, a small group of Sperry employees met to discuss how they might help local agencies which serve the handicapped. The idea which came out of this meeting was to hold a softball marathon which would raise funds to help one agency aiding the handicapped. The idea mushroomed within Sperry, and the first year over 350 employees participated in a game that lasted 29 consecutive hours, with 17 of those hours played in a torrential downpour.

Each year since that time, the community minded spirit within Sperry, and their deep compassion for the handicapped has built a larger and better Marathon. Each year, the concept behind the Marathon—concern and compassion for the handicapped—has been carried to more and more Long Island residents and has brought about greater understanding and acceptance of our handicapped neighbors.

The Sperry Softball League has shown others what caring for people is all about. They have helped to foster a more accepting environment on Long Island, in which the handicapped can live and work.

The Rehabilitation Institute—TRI—is a voluntary nonprofit organization founded in 1965. Its founders, Dr. Edmund Neuhaus and Mrs. Louise Friedman, whose diligence and hardwork have spurred the blossoms of the institute, have thus far placed over 1,300 rehabilitated clients in competitive employment and have returned hundreds more to healthy productive lives as homemakers. By virtue of its exemplary achievement, TRI has garnered the respect of its peers. TRI was awarded the 1976 program of the year award by the Long Island Rehabilitation and Counseling Association—the first award of its kind ever given.

Accepting the award for Sperry were vice president of personnel, Mr. Harold Dahl, and the commissioner of the Sperry Softball League, Mr. Lou Jaklitsch. Although both of these men work at full time jobs, they have evinced that there is always time to work and care for others. Other distinguished members of the marathon committee representing Sperry at the ball were Jim McDonald, Art Rommel, and Ms. Chris Lynch.

CONSUMER ADVOCACY BILL

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which recently appeared in the Laurel Leader-Call, an excellent newspaper serving south Mississippi. I think that this commentary states quite well my own reasons for feeling that the very last thing this Nation needs is an Agency for Consumer Advocacy.

The article follows:

CONSUMER ADVOCACY BILL

Along with the first crabgrass and dandelions of spring, that hardy perennial the Agency for Consumer Advocacy bill is popping up again. This year, the idea is to railroad it through Congress so fast that effective opposition won't have time to develop.

The ACA is an idea whose time has come and gone. Since its proposal eight years ago—when it was called the Consumer Protection Agency—there has been a revolution in consumer protection acts and regulatory reorganization. These new developments include the establishment of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Federal Energy Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Magnuson-Moss Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act, the Hart-Scott Antitrust Improvements Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Medical Devices Amendments of 1976, the "Government in the Sunshine" Act, the Freedom of Information Act Amendments, and countless other consumer protection bills.

Consumer "advocacy" sounds like a great idea, in the abstract. It isn't until you get beneath the label that you learn what a bureaucratic farce the sponsors have in mind.

Consider the following list of functions for the agency, to which has been added, in parentheses, the existing governmental bodies responsible for the same function:

Plead the consumer's case within the government. (White House Consumers Advisor.)

Improve the ways rules and regulations are made. (Commission on Federal Paperwork; Office of Management and Budget; General Accounting Office)

Aid the President and Congress in identifying inefficient government programs. (All of the above.)

Help correct inequities in those programs that are designed to protect consumers. (Consumer Advisor; Paperwork Commission; Ombudsmen and Consumer Advocates in the various federal agencies and departments; senators and representatives)

Help fight inflation by monitoring governmental actions that unnecessarily raise costs for consumers. (Council on Wage and Price Stability)

Litigate on behalf of consumers in court. (Federal Trade Commission; Justice Department; Consumer Product Safety Commission; others)

The truth is, the ACA would have nothing to do with individual consumers. Rather, it would function as a taxpayer-financed mouthpiece and lawyer for self-appointed consumer activists.

The ACA would also have a license to in-

terfere in the proceedings of other federal regulatory agencies, which were themselves established to represent the consumer.

MAHONING COUNTY COURTHOUSE "HISTORY OF LAW" MURALS TO BE HONORED IN EXHIBITION

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the "spirit of the law" has never been more magnificently captured than through the four murals displayed in the Rotunda of the Mahoning County Courthouse in Youngstown, Ohio.

I am pleased to announce that the Williams College Graduate School of Art History in Williamstown, Mass., will be honoring the four murals in the Mahoning County Courthouse as well as other famous paintings by Edwin Howland Blashfield—1848-1936—during an exhibition in its museum of art in the month of February 1978.

Mr. Blashfield was a student of Bonnat in Paris and a member of all the leading painting societies in America and abroad. He was also the president of the American Federation of Fine Arts. Mr. Blashfield was given the place of honor in the Rotunda of the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., and his paintings hang in some of the country's most notable buildings.

The paintings in the Mahoning County Courthouse were painted at the suggestion and under the direction of Charles F. Owsley, architect, in 1911, and with the cooperation of the building commission. The commission believed that the erection of this monumental building, expressing one of the highest forms of architecture, should include some recognition of the sister art, painting.

The four phases in the "history of law" are depicted in these paintings: The law of classical antiquity, the law of the Bible, the law of the Middle Ages, and modern law.

The first period is a picture showing the Shepherdess symbolizing the ruling force in the time of antiquity, which was "love and tenderness," as further expressed by the child holding the lamb.

The second painting shows the law of force by arms, during the Roman domination of the world. The next painting shows the "law of faith" during the medieval period when the church was the dominant force of law.

The final painting, and perhaps the most interesting one, shows "modern law," which is created by the people and for the people. This idea is forcibly brought out by the copy of the Declaration of Independence held up as a model for all nations, and under the right arm of the figure is the ballot box.

The small figure in this picture, standing next to a telephone and machinery,

conveys the fact that laws of all nations over all ages are fast becoming reduced to a common standard by reason of rapid communication and understanding among them.

Mr. Speaker, these paintings have served as an inspiration to all who have passed through the halls of the Mahoning County Courthouse. It is my pleasure to bring public recognition of these excellent works of art.

UNITED STATES BACKS DOWN AT SUGAR NEGOTIATIONS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the international negotiations between sugar producing and consuming nations in Geneva, which opened 6 weeks ago, are scheduled to end tomorrow. The purpose of this conference was the formulation of a new international sugar agreement to insure stable and fair prices for producers and consumers alike.

According to reports relayed to me from Dr. Lee Richardson, president of the Consumer Federation of America, who is serving as a consumer representative at the conference, it appears unlikely that an agreement will be reached before adjournment. In an effort to reach an accord, however, the United States has retreated substantially from its earlier bargaining position in the talks. The American delegation is now willing to agree to a floor price for sugar of 11 cents per pound, well above the current market price. Even more significantly, our delegation has compromised its demand that an extensive reserve supply of sugar be maintained to protect against sharply escalating prices. Early in the conference, the United States had proposed a reserve of four million tons; our delegates have now suggested 2.5 million tons, 37 percent less.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that international commodity negotiations such as these require careful diplomacy and judicious compromises to obtain an accord acceptable to all parties. I am concerned, however, that the American representatives appear willing to make numerous concessions to the sugar producing states while receiving little in return to protect the American consumer against a repetition of the 1974 sugar boom when prices soared to more than 60 cents per pound. We should not agree to a price floor unless we obtain an accompanying price ceiling in return. I would prefer to see no international sugar agreement at all than to acquiesce in an accord which fails to represent adequately the interests of the American retail consumer.

I look forward to receiving the reports of Dr. Richardson and the other two consumer representatives who attended the Geneva negotiations when they re-

turn to the United States next week. I am hopeful that the contribution made by these consumer spokespersons will encourage the State Department to continue the practice of inviting qualified consumer representatives to attend future commodity conferences which relate to the interests of the American retail consumer.

U.S. COVERUP OF ARGENTINIAN TERRORIST INVESTMENT IN NEW YORK BANK?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, recent investigations in Argentina have revealed that a group of Argentinian financiers, the Graiver group, which owned two banks in New York City and others in Latin America and Europe, used their banks and dummy accounts to transfer out of Argentina millions of dollars in kidnapping ransoms extorted by the Peronist Montoneros terrorist organization, and additional millions embezzled from the Argentinian treasury by deposed President Isabel Peron and her Finance Minister, Jose Gelbard, a member of the Graiver group now living in Washington, D.C., and resisting extradition. The Peronist Movement is broad enough to include the leftist Montoneros which collaborated with the Trotskyite Communist ERP terrorists, as well as unrepentant Nazis who fled to Argentina after World War II.

In this country the Graivers operated flamboyantly, gaining introductions to high level business and political circles by paying political figures large "consulting fees." Again, the involvement of Sol M. Linowitz, friend and adviser to Mr. Gelbard, with Latin American leftists is noted.

And I submit the following article exposing the current known facts of this affair for the particular consideration of my colleagues on the Banking Committee:

[From the Review of the News, May 25, 1977]

BANKING FOR TERRORISTS

(By John Rees)

Early this month the press of Argentina and Uruguay broke news of an enormous scandal involving an Argentinian international banking group (the Graivers) which invested millions of dollars obtained from kidnappings and extortion by the Montoneros terrorists, along with untold millions in public funds embezzled by a former Argentine President and her Minister of Finance, who were secretly in league with the Leftist terrorists. A New York bank was bought and used to provide the terrorists and their criminal allies with a "laundered" monthly income from the interest on their loot.

As a result of these manipulations, the American Bank and Trust Company failed—the fourth largest bank failure in U.S. history. David Graiver and his father, Juan, the leaders of the investment group, are reported dead. The larcenous President Isabel Peron

was deposed in March 1976 and is in jail awaiting trial; her Minister of Finance, Jose Gelbard, has taken refuge in Washington, D.C., and is resisting extradition with the help of influential figures in the Carter Administration.

Federal and state authorities have investigated the collapse of the bank and simply closed their investigations. Neither is anything likely to be done about the high-level political figures who were involved on the New York end of the Graivers' "terrorist investment service." Nevertheless, the public interest requires an examination of the evidence linking U.S. citizens to millions of dollars worth of assets belonging to Marxist-Leninist assassins.

The Graiver fortune was founded by Juan Graiver (father of David and Isidoro) and his brother Pedro, who emigrated to Argentina from Poland as boys. The Graiver brothers were backers of dictator Juan Peron and made their first millions in the early 1950s in real-estate speculation and construction before moving into banking in partnership with Juan's brilliant son David in the 1960s. In 1973, the Graivers and Jose Ber Gelbard were financial backers of Peronist President Hector Campora, who prepared the way for the return of Juan and Isabel Peron later in the year by legalizing the various Communist parties and releasing hundreds of jailed terrorists.

Peron's appeal for support was to the revolutionary Left, the radical student sector and the frenetic labor unions. During Juan Peron's exile (1956-1973), the Peronists had encouraged formation of the Montoneros terrorist organization, the armed wing of the Peronist Youth, which carried out vicious attacks on the Argentine military and on American-owned businesses and their executives. Key Montoneros received terrorist training in Cuba, as well as indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism. These terrorists soon criticized Peron for being too "moderate," and when Juan Peron chided them at his 1974 May Day rally, 30,000 Montoneros and their supporters stalked out of a mass rally in Buenos Aires.

After Peron died on July 1, 1974, the Montoneros and their crypto-Communist supporters among the Peronists planned to take absolute power via "popular struggle" and utterly defeat the Argentine conservatives and the military.

Meanwhile, the Montoneros-connected Jose Gelbard was Finance Minister in the Campora and the Peron Governments. He was also neck-deep in the Graiver banking operation. On Gelbard's advice, Isabel Peron established an account in Juan and David Graiver's Banco Comercial de la Plata in November 1972, six months before she and her husband returned to Argentina. In the name of the "Isabel Peron Cruzada de la Solidaridad." Then, as the Argentine newspaper La Nueva Provincia reported:

"Apparently in the spring of 1974, through the help of Jose Ber Gelbard, the Montoneros organizations deposited a \$17 million check of the United Swiss Bank in the La Plata Comercial Bank. Later this money, a product of kidnappings and robberies by Peronist armed bands, was deposited in two banks belonging to Graiver—the Banco de America del Sur and the Bank Pour l'Amérique du Sud of Belgium, and a third bank, the Suisse-Israel Bank, with which Gelbard, Broner and Graiver and other leaders of the group constantly worked."

These banks were closely linked with the American Bank and Trust Company (A.B.T.) in which David Graiver and his father soon purchased controlling interest for \$14 million, of which \$9 million was in cash. The

Montoneros terrorists, you see, had received a reported \$60 million ransom from the 1974 kidnappings of the Born brothers, Argentinian grain magnates, and there was need for serious cash management. The \$17 million Montoneros "investment," handled by the Graiver group, brought the terrorists a monthly income from interest of \$130,000.

In a May 4, 1977, press conference, Argentine President Jorge Videla said that the investigation of the Graiver group had been initiated by the Buenos Aires Provincial Police, who were conducting an investigation of illegal currency traffic. The investigation led to operations of the Graiver group and developed two aspects, one of them purely criminal and related to illegal currency traffic. "The second aspect, the most significant one," said President Videla, "is that this so-called Graiver group was working for subversion. It had received several million dollars to operate, both inside the country and abroad, for the benefit of subversion and with complete awareness of the origin of this capital."

The Argentinian government charges that deposed President Isabel Peron, with the assistance of José Gelbard, also diverted huge sums of public funds through the "Cruzada" account. It is believed that money from this account was in fact used by David Graiver in purchasing the American Bank and Trust Company; and that the New York bank was one of the means used to transfer the terrorists' ransom to other Graiver-owned banks in Belgium and Switzerland for exchange into "usable" currency.

As reporter Richard Karp observed in his meticulously researched articles on the collapse of the A.B.T. published by *Barron's* in December 1976: "How much money filtered out of the Argentine treasury into Isabel's account is anyone's guess. When the generals moved in on Isabel last spring, Economic Minister Gelbard fled to the U.S."

"El Grupo Graiver" did not operate in our country in a vacuum. When David Graiver, the portly, 35-year old Argentinian operator, moved to New York in 1975 to buy controlling interest in the American Bank and Trust Company, he had the help of many prominent political and financial figures from the "Liberal" Establishment. Papers obtained by our investigative news team establish links between one or more members of the Graiver group and Sol M. Linowitz, President Carter's Panama Canal giveaway architect; Mario Noto, the recently appointed Deputy Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; New York City Mayor Abraham Beame; New York City campaign treasurer Howard Samuels, who placed the Carter campaign funds in Graiver's American Bank and Trust; New York City Democratic Party political bosses Mead Esposito and Patrick Cunningham; and, Theodore W. Kheel, a well-known labor negotiator who was on Graiver's payroll as a "consultant" at \$100,000 a year.

Others involved include Abraham Feinberg of New York and Phillip Klutznick of Chicago, both well-known Democratic Party fundraisers.

According to published reports, Graiver and his Banco Comercial de la Plata were provided with a letter of recommendation from U.S. Ambassador John P. Hill; from O.A.S. Secretary-General Alejandro Orfila, who received a large loan from A.B.T.; from former Secretary of State William P. Rogers; and, from former Citibank chairman George Moore.

Apparently no one publicly expressed curiosity about the origins of the \$9 million cash and the additional \$5 million in various securities with which the Argentinian banker bought controlling interest in American Bank and Trust. After all, such well-known

"Liberals" as Theodore Kheel were introducing Graiver into New York City political and financial circles.

Once in control of A.B.T. and its assets, Graiver began making heavy loans to his other ventures in Belgium, Switzerland, and Argentina. Graiver's New York political friends received loans, some of which were highly questionable, and received various "consulting fees." At the same time, A.B.T. received such plums as the Carter campaign account—which may or may not have been augmented as a means of purchasing political favor.

The bubble did not burst until August 1976, after the Montoneros, harried by the Argentine military Government which deposed Isabel Peron in March 1976, demanded the return of their illicit millions.

On August 6, 1976, a few days before the total collapse of the Graiver financial empire, David Graiver left New York's LaGuardia Airport with a pilot and copilot in a chartered Falcon jet. Headed for Acapulco, Mexico, Graiver was reportedly carrying \$28 million in negotiable securities. Around 2 A.M. on the following day, the jet went down in Mexico. The bodies of three occupants were burned beyond recognition. No flight recorder and no voice recorder were found at the crash site. A Mexican report refers to "tape transcriptions" of a pilot-to-tower conversation—but the tapes were erased before they could be audited by investigators, and the near automatic participation by the U.S. National Transportation Safety Board in the investigation of the crash of a flight which originated in the United States was curiously omitted.

Most damaging to the official Mexican report of the Graiver crash is a photo of the wreckage which shows part of the aircraft sitting amidst upright trees. As *Barron's* commented: "If the Falcon had careened into the wooded mountainside, it would have plowed those trees under like so many matchsticks. In other words, Falcon Jet 888 AR did not collide with a mountain, but simply fell out of the sky, possibly the result of an explosion in the air."

Relatives of David Graiver went to the accident site and "positively" identified the remains, which they quickly had cremated in violation of their religion. David Graiver had officially ceased to exist, but the possibility remains that he may have staged the crash and vanished (perhaps) during a refueling stop.

With David Graiver declared dead, the investigations into the operations of the American Bank and Trust Company commenced. In its December articles, *Barron's* informed the American financial community that the Graiver-controlled A.B.T. had been "robbed of its assets via massive borrowing on behalf of dummy companies" and that the Graivers had stolen depositors' money by diverting it into fake investments. The article concluded, "the ingenuity of those who looted the bank was matched only by the laxity of those charged with watching it."

In Argentina, where the investigation of the Graiver group's operations is continuing, many of its members are under arrest. These include Lidia Papaleo de Graiver, David's wife or widow; Isidoro Graiver, his brother; and David's uncle, Pedro Graiver. Their assets, and those of other Graiver group members including Eva Gtnacht de Graiver, Enrique Brodsky, and Jorge Rubinstein, have been frozen by the Argentinian authorities.

Since it is now apparent that a major criminal network and terrorist support apparatus was operating via the Graivers' banking interests in New York, Buenos Aires, Belgium, and Switzerland, it is appropriate

to examine those who were associated with them. They include:

Sol M. Linowitz, who according to a January account in the Buenos Aires daily, *La Nacion*, has acted as José Gelbard's U.S. attorney, claiming that Argentina's request for his extradition is part of an anti-Semitic plot. This has since been denied by a spokesman for Mr. Linowitz, who stated that although Ambassador Linowitz knew Sr. Gelbard, they had no professional relationship.

Maybe so, maybe not. When the Argentinian Government made its formal request for Gelbard's extradition in December 1976, the radical Council on Hemispheric Affairs (C.O.H.A.), directed by New School professor Larry Birns who has been active in pro-Castro endeavors, rallied to Gelbard's support. Since a number of those involved with C.O.H.A. have in the past acted as "Linowitz surrogates" in producing distillations of the Linowitz Commission recommendations (financed by the Ford Foundation), C.O.H.A. may reasonably be thought to have acted as a "Linowitz surrogate" in aiding Gelbard.

Castroite Birns charged that the extradition request was "an act of political subterfuge" and suggested that anti-Semitism was involved. Meanwhile *Argentine Outlook*, a newsletter with which Birns is connected, has been supporting revolutionary "political prisoners" in Argentina and has charged that the Argentina anti-Communist military Government is "fascist," "reactionary," and deliberately anti-Semitic.

Mario Noto, prior to his taking office as Deputy General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on May 16, 1977, was José Gelbard's Washington, D.C., attorney.

Mayor Abraham Beame of New York, between his terms as City comptroller and mayor, was a director of Graiver's American Bank and Trust and head of the bank's finance committee.

New York City Democratic Party political bosses Mead Esposito and Patrick Cunningham both received fees from Graiver's A.B.T.

Former Secretary of State William P. Rogers, former Citibank chairman George Moore, and Organization of American States Secretary-General Alejandro Orfila provided friendly references as to David Graiver's integrity. Perhaps coincidentally, Secretary-General Orfila received a \$300,000 loan from A.B.T.

Theodore W. Kheel, the prominent New York labor negotiator, received a \$25,000 quarterly stipend from David Graiver for "advice and consultation." He also helped, and was helped by, the Graivers in making several major investments.

Howard Samuels, a former New York State gubernatorial candidate, former head of the Off-Track Betting operation in New York, and Jimmy Carter's state finance chairman, used the A.B.T. for the safekeeping of Carter campaign contributions. This may be one reason why the Argentinian press has speculated that the Graivers or their bank were themselves contributors to the Presidential campaign of James Earl Carter Jr.

Republican Party political boss Vincent Albano received from the Graivers some \$7 million in cash for his controlling stock in the Century National Bank and Trust Company. Graiver subsequently borrowed \$500,000 from Century and pledged his Century interest against some of his massive borrowings from A.B.T.

Abraham Feinberg was chairman of A.B.T. when it closed its doors last September. Phillip Klutznick was A.B.T.'s chairman from 1963 to 1972, and was also chairman of the Swiss holding company that sold A.B.T. to Graiver. As Richard Karp commented in *Barron's*:

"All of these big loans to Graiver had to be approved by ABT's board of directors or its executive committee, or at the very least by some high officer or a director such as Abe Feinberg, Stanley Kreitman, Saul Kagan, Jose Klein (who kept his seat) and Alexander Szasz (Klein's right-hand man)."

"Even if one grants that David Graiver simply hoodwinked the officers and directors of ABT into lending him large sums of money, it is unlikely that he could have acted alone in diverting deposits in ABT to his numerous dummy operations overseas. Huge sums flowed through ABT as time deposits and wound up as 'investments' in Graiver's deep pockets in other countries. Who were his accomplices? That remains a mystery."

But, of course, that is not the only mystery, or the only unanswered question. Others of paramount concern are:

Why was the F.B.I. investigation of the Graivers' New York operation closed?

Was José Gelbard the contact between American Bank and Trust and the Argentinian terrorists?

How did José Gelbard achieve "political refugee" status in the United States, and why was this extended to his son, Fernando?

Were Fernando Gelbard and David Graiver partners, and are Fernando Gelbard's recent trips to Switzerland related to Graiver family businesses?

What investments are the Gelbards now making in the Los Angeles area? With whose money?

What is the status of the F.D.I.C. report on these outrages, and how will investors in American Bank and Trust be reimbursed?

Did the Graivers and Gelbard hold a meeting in mid-1976 with Robert Vesco in Santa Domingo to form Overseas International Services?

What is being covered up and who is being protected?

The answers to these and other questions are known to a small and decreasing number of people. David Graiver has vanished and is presumed dead; his father, Juan Graiver, has now been reported dead; two lawyers intimately involved in the Graiver-Gelbard relationships have died mysteriously.

Fortunately others who know this story, and who have documentary evidence, are alive. Now that well-organized terrorists have learned how to operate through our banking system, it is imperative that those who know the full details of these transactions provide public testimony. Conservatives are urging Senators William Proxmire and Congressman Henry Reuss, respective Chairmen of the Senate and House Banking Committees, to look into these matters at once.

ROBBIE FTOREK

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week, Robbie Ftorek, a 152-pound, wiry, towheaded young man from Needham, Mass., was named the most valuable player in the World Hockey League. The smallest player in the entire WHL, Ftorek has earned the same trophy which in past years had belonged to other hockey greats such as Gordie Howe, Bobby Hull, and Marc Tardiff.

Ftorek's story begins back at Needham

High School and continues through a spectacular performance at the 1972 Olympics. Rejected by the National Hockey League because of his weight, he emerged in the past 2 years as one of the Nation's premier players. His determination, talent, and assertiveness was especially visible during his team's performance in the Canada Cup when he was Team U.S.A.'s most valuable player.

Gordie Howe, during the presentation of the award at The Club in New York's World Trade Center, said that Ftorek, "had been an inspiration" to all of New England's upcoming crop of junior hockey players. More than that, Ftorek's accomplishments on the ice have done a good deal in promoting New England's already burgeoning reputation as the home of tremendous high school and college hockey talent. Recruiters no longer have to spend months exclusively in Canada evaluating just Canadian talent. New England high schools and colleges are offering the best competitive hockey programs in the Nation.

I salute Robbie Ftorek; his determination, skill, perseverance, and professionalism have done a great deal in bringing New England to the forefront in American hockey.

FOREIGN OIL TANKERS HURT THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have taken the opportunity to acquaint my colleagues in the Congress with the problems which are caused to the United States by foreign oil tankers.

The damage being done to the American economy by the carriage of so much of our oil imports in ships flying the flags of other nations is one of the most serious aspects of this problem.

So that my colleagues will be aware of the gravity of the situation, I am placing in the RECORD a copy of a fact sheet which has been provided to me by the U.S. Maritime Committee to Turn the Tide—a committee composed of shipping companies, unions and land-based industries which support our merchant marine:

FOREIGN OIL TANKERS HURT THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

While the United States strives for domestic energy independence, we rely greatly on imported oil transported in foreign flag tankers. We are producing about one million fewer barrels of oil a day than in 1973, and importing a million more. Our dependence on foreign oil imports is growing daily.

The U.S. is now importing 45% of its oil. 96% is carried on foreign flag tankers.

Next year our oil bill to foreign nations will come to perhaps \$40 billion. We pay \$1 billion alone to foreign flag tankers to carry our imported oil. By contrast, U.S. flag tankers return 71¢ of every dollar they receive back to our economy. This negative balance of payments position has recently effected the worst trade deficit in our nation's history.

Foreign flag oil tankers are used by multi-

national companies to shelter earnings from petroleum production, refining and distribution.

No one knows what it actually costs multinational companies to ship oil to the U.S. on foreign flag tankers. Rather than reflecting true operating costs, it appears that transportation prices are no more than artificial numbers set to enable multi-nationals to transfer the greatest possible profits to their foreign flag of convenience shipping subsidiaries. These enormous profits basically are beyond the reach of American taxation.

Most other maritime nations have recognized the economic benefits to be derived from a cargo preference policy, as evidenced by the adoption of various forms of cargo preference by 38 nations. Among them are France, Spain, Japan, Venezuela and the Arab oil exporting nations.

It's time to turn the tide in favor of the U.S. economy and the U.S. taxpayer. We need to support a cargo preference program that would give U.S. tankers a greater share in the transportation of our oil imports.

WHY IS THE MIGHTY SOVIET UNION AFRAID OF THE FRAIL SEMYON GLUZMAN?

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions one after another of my colleagues has stood up and asked why the Soviet Union will not let Soviet Jews emigrate to Israel. Why does the mighty Soviet government expend so much energy harassing and repressing Jews who request permission to leave? Today I rise on behalf of a Soviet prisoner of conscience, Semyon Gluzman, who dreams of going to Israel but who languishes in a Soviet strict-regime labor camp for his decency and his dreams, and I again ask the same questions.

Dr. Gluzman is a 29-year-old psychiatrist who graduated from Kiev Medical School in 1968 and was offered a position as a psychiatrist at the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital, where Leonid Plyusch was being held at the time. Because he recognized and refused to be associated with the morally depraved Soviet practice of committing healthy political prisoners to psychiatric hospitals and medically treating them for insanity, Dr. Gluzman declined the position.

In 1971, Gluzman joined two fellow psychiatrists, who remain anonymous, in writing an alternative psychiatric diagnosis in absentia for Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko in which they rejected the official finding that Grigorenko was mentally ill. For this action motivated by human decency, Gluzman was convicted of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda," a standard catch-all charge commonly leveled at political dissenters, and sentenced to 7 years in a strict regime corrective labor camp.

While incarcerated, Dr. Gluzman has been strongly influenced by his fellow Jewish prisoners and ardent Zionists Anatoly Altman, Hillel Butman, Leib Knokh, and Lev Yagman, from whom came his dream of becoming a resident

and citizen of Israel. In October 1975 Gluzman wrote to his parents:

I am a Jew, and my Judaism speaks for more than memory—memory of the victims of genocide and of the persecutions caused by prejudice become dogma. My Judaism lies in the knowledge of our people as they are today, with their own State, their own history and, happily their own weapons. My Uncle Abram who was shot at Babi Yar did not grant me any "reconsiderations." Every September my spirit seethes with indignation for him. You know why.

In denying its citizens, Jewish and people of other faiths alike, the freedom to emigrate, the Soviet Union not only violates the Helsinki accord, to which it is a signatory, but it violates a fundamental and universal right, for without freedom to emigrate, the individual does not have a choice between embracing the principles of government under which he was born and seeking a different form of government elsewhere. Without that choice, there can be no genuine freedom, democracy, or legitimacy to a nation.

Again, I ask, why is the mighty Soviet Government afraid of a handful of people who wish to leave, who would no longer be in the U.S.S.R.? Perhaps the Soviet rulers are not afraid of them, as such, but of the influence they might have over the millions who remain—of the massive discontent that is locked away in their hearts and of the widespread protest that would erupt if that discontent came to the surface.

If the Soviet Union is the mighty world power it purports to be, then it should not be afraid of people like Semyon Gluzman. We cannot rest until all the people who wish to leave the Soviet Union are allowed to go.

HATCH ACT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the obvious factors in the debate and ultimate vote in the House on the Hatch Act issue is the great preponderance of editorial opposition to H.R. 10.

In fact, outside of the Washington Post whose support of the bill is conditional, editorials across the country have been appearing in one voice against the emasculating of the Hatch Act.

Typical of the editorial commentary is one broadcast by WBBM, CBS Radio, Chicago, on May 18, in opposition to changes in the Hatch Act. The editorial follows for the review of the Members:

HATCH ACT

We are opposed to changes in the Hatch Act that would allow federal employees to participate in political campaigns by working directly for candidates or seeking office themselves. Changing the current restrictions on the political activity of civil servants would open the door to too many chances for abuse.

The House of Representatives is ready to vote on a bill allowing civil servants to participate more fully in the political process. But they have enough access to the process right now. They can contribute to cam-

paigns and they can, of course, vote. But they can't have a working involvement in campaigns and they shouldn't.

The Hatch Act was written to protect civil servants from political abuse but these changes could let them in for terrible trouble. Although the bill includes provisions prohibiting bosses from coercing employees or conducting political business on government time, it would be very difficult to prove that anyone had broken the law. As all of us who have ever worked in an office know, it's easy to exert pressure on co-workers very subtly.

Some civil servants might indeed have a better understanding of who should be elected to office and why. But their first job is to keep the government running smoothly in spite of the changes in political leadership at the top. And that's the way it should stay.

USDA HONORS POWELL COUNTY RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a select group of fellow Kentuckians from neighboring Powell County, Ky. The Powell County Rural Development Committee has been singled out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to receive a Superior Service Award at the 31st Honor Awards Ceremony presented by our friend, the Secretary of Agriculture, Bob Bergland.

This national recognition for the Powell County Rural Development Committee is being presented for the committee's service as a dynamic catalyst and a followup resource in stimulating involvement, by many Kentuckians, in projects which have dramatically improved the social and economic well-being of Powell County, Ky.

As chairman of the Congressional Rural Caucus, a member of the Family Farms and Rural Development, and Special Studies Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, and one who is deeply interested in rural development, I am honored that my neighbors in Powell County have been singled out by Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland to receive this award. The Powell County Rural Development Committee has had a long record of involvement in rural development since its beginnings in January of 1962. One of the main reasons for its effectiveness, in a rural county in the Appalachian foothills with a total population of over 7,700, lies in the fact that its members have been an integral part of every community development effort in the county during the last 14 years.

I understand that the achievements of the committee are long and varied, its activities including the construction of an 80-bed nursing home; the development of a dental health education program; the establishment of a well-baby clinic and a rescue squad, enrolling over 30 volunteers in an emergency medical technicians school; support of the annual Red-Reiver clean-up program; en-

couragement of the fiscal court to purchase the necessary equipment to meet State landfill standards; the preparation of an environmental inventory for a sewer and water plan for the community; the planning of a nature study center and the organizing of a successful effort in establishing a city park; work with local leaders in improving community water systems and better sewage disposals; pushed for and established a local radio station, adult education classes at local schools, vocational education classes, and local craftsmen classes, for local forest products.

As you can see from this impressive record, Mr. Speaker, the Powell County Rural Development Committee has distinguished its citizens, the State, and the Nation, in their worth-while endeavors on behalf of their community. I am pleased to recognize the members of the committee, a list of which is attached below, for their fine work and outstanding achievements—exemplary achievements which should constitute a challenge to us all:

POWELL COUNTY RURAL DEVELOPMENT (INTER-AGENCY) COMMITTEE

Barbara Crabtree, Ky. Dept. Human Resources.
Doug Fig, U.S. Forest Service.
Robert Friel, Powell County School.
Dan Grigson, Coop. Ext. Ser.
Grace Marsh, Bur. Rehab.
John Moore, U.S. Forest Service.
Ronald Ray, FmHa.
Rae Rogers, Comp. Care Ctr.
Glyn Skidmore, Ag Stab. & Conserv. Ser.
Rose Swope, Coop. Ext. Ser.
Jackson Taylor, Coop. Ext. Ser.
Roger Wiedeberg, Soil Conserv. Ser.
Ann May Howard, Ky. River Foothills Council.
Mary Lavin, Powell Co. Manpower Office.

THE FOUNTAIN SQUARE SENIOR CITIZENS CENTER

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Fountain Square Senior Citizens Center which is located in the Sixth Congressional District at 901 Shelby Street in Indianapolis celebrated its fourth anniversary on May 21, 1977.

Since the center opened in 1973, it has provided senior citizens on the southside of Indianapolis a place to relax, meet their friends and share the companionship of other senior citizens through various activities.

There are two individuals associated with the center who deserve special recognition for their commitment and dedication to the success of the center.

As director, Mrs. Betty Sexson has given above and beyond the call of duty to assure the Fountain Square Senior Citizens Center never closes to those who need its services.

Another person who must be commended for their work with the center, is Mr. George Cafouros, who publishes the Southside Spotlight, a weekly community

newspaper. Mr. Cafouros has used his newspaper as a vehicle for community service by publicizing the center and when it was short on funds he assisted in raising several thousand dollars so the center could stay open.

As a member of the Select Committee on Aging in the House of Representatives, I am committed to helping our older Americans and will continue to be of assistance to the Fountain Square Senior Citizens Center.

Mr. Speaker, while congressional business prevented me from attending the fourth anniversary celebration of the Fountain Square Senior Citizens Center, I wanted to make my colleagues aware of the dedicated and hardworking people which reside in Indiana's Sixth Congressional District.

THE GREAT TUNA-PORPOISE WAR

HON. HELEN S. MEYNER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mrs. MEYNER. Mr. Speaker, the "great tuna-porpoise war" has been in progress now for over 5 years. Its earliest beginnings go back some 25 years when the Japanese tuna industry was offering such stiff competition that our tuna fleet decided to switch to the purse seine method of "on porpoise" fishing from large netboats costing about \$5 million each. The rewards for this capital investment were great: Just one of these sleek vessels returning from a 3-month cruise can expect to sell a full load of tuna for about \$1 million. The lucrative profits, reminiscent of those earned by New England whalers in the 19th century, have drawn giant, multinational corporations into the business. Today, in the tuna fishing waters of the eastern tropical Pacific, few foreign boats can compete successfully with our efficient fleet.

But at what environmental cost. Since the introduction of the new method, approximately 6 million porpoises have been drowned in the great purse seine nets of the American tunaboats.

Five years ago, the tuna-porpoise controversy began in earnest with the passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. The Federal Government then gave notice to the industry that the slaughter of porpoises would have to be "ratcheted" downward, with zero incidental mortality the ultimate goal.

Progress in enforcing compliance with the act has been less than encouraging. Since 1972, with a 1-year grace period granted by Congress and 3 years of an indulgent, dilatory administration, tuna boats have drowned an estimated 800,000 porpoises.

Encouraged by their success in delaying the enforcement of the act, the tuna industry has now repeated its insistence that more time is needed for compliance. We have a bill before us (H.R. 6970) that would further extend the over 100,000 per year allowable kill.

The March 1 quotas released by the Department of Commerce of the new

administration provoked the tuna industry. Tunaboat owners "beached" their boats and threatened to transfer their vessels to foreign flags. Cannery employees, pawns in the struggle, have been laid off by the thousands in California and Puerto Rico. Price increases of 20 to 50 percent for a can of tuna have been predicted by the industry. On the other side, environmentalists have called for a consumer boycott of tuna.

While I am deeply concerned about the supermarket cost of a can of tuna in America this summer, I am more worried about another aspect which in the heat of this internal struggle we tend to overlook. How does American permissiveness of the slaughter of porpoise look to other countries? Porpoise, a cheap source of protein, is needed and used by other countries for human consumption. We talk with compassion of feeding the world's starving people, but we leave 6 million porpoise for the sharks.

Crucial diplomatic negotiations are scheduled this month for the protection of marine mammals. In Australia, the International Whaling Commission meets shortly. What of our insistence to Japan and the U.S.S.R. that they adhere to strict "management procedures" in bringing about the replenishing of the world's depleted stocks of whales? Can we expect them to comply when we ourselves refuse to "back off" of another cetacean? In California, the Inter-America Tropical Tuna Commission convenes in June. Can the United States expect Central and South American members to accept tough restrictions on the killing of porpoise if we ourselves refuse to improve our record?

Legislation is before us, Mr. Speaker, which would undercut the Marine Mammal Protection Act, extending for 2 more years the indulgence which the tuna industry has used to excellent advantage for the last 5. The passage of this bill would simply indicate to other nations whom we face at the negotiating tables that we do not take seriously our talk about protecting marine mammals. If we do not, why should they?

PRESIDENT CARTER'S NEW ARMS TRANSFER POLICY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, President Carter's new arms sales policy which is based on a presumption against such transactions is a step in the right direction.

I am particularly pleased to note that the President is committed to a reduction in the sale of our arms export business, to limiting the transfer of advanced weapons and their technology, to curbing the sales promotion activities of American arms merchants—Government and private—and to convening an arms suppliers' conference to discuss multilateral action in this field.

I strongly support this new policy. It

deserves the commendation and support of the Congress.

This new policy is a great advance. But we need to consider going further in some areas. Specifically we should look into setting an overall limit annually for all our arms transfers, perhaps around \$9 billion as a starter; setting regional sublimits within the overall figure; and confirming arms transfers exclusively to official channels.

REPRESENTATIVE LINDY BOGGS RECEIVES HONORARY DEGREE FROM SAINT MARY-OF-THE-WOODS COLLEGE

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular and respected Members of the House of Representatives is our distinguished colleague, CORINNE C. Boggs, better known as LINDY, representing in Congress the Second District of Louisiana.

Many of us in the House of Representatives have known LINDY and knew her late husband, the distinguished majority leader of the House, Hale, for many, many years and few persons have contributed so much to the service of the House and to their country than Hale and LINDY Boggs.

Since coming to Congress in 1973 to succeed Hale, LINDY has been an outstanding leader in a wide variety of areas of concern.

I am delighted therefore, Mr. Speaker—and not at all surprised—to note that on May 8, 1977, LINDY Boggs was awarded an honorary degree by Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Ind.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the remarks of Mrs. Thomas Walsh, a graduate of Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, who lives in Washington, D.C., on the presentation of this honorary degree to our distinguished colleague.

TESTIMONIAL FOR CORINNE CLAIBORNE BOGGS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SAINT MARY-OF-THE-WOODS COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, MAY 8, 1977

Lindy Boggs, the first woman to chair the national convention of a major American political party, has compiled an impressive record on behalf of justice in the political forum.

Born to a politically active Louisiana family, Corinne Claiborne met her future husband, Hale Boggs, at Tulane University. With their marriage and his subsequent election to Congress, Lindy Boggs was thrown into grass roots political activity, becoming an active campaigner for causes and candidates at local, state and national levels.

Her years of volunteer activity and the political savvy that developed with them were recognized in March, 1973 when—following the disappearance of her husband's plane over Alaska the previous October—Lindy Boggs was elected to his seat in Congress by 81 per cent of the voters in the second district of Louisiana. She was overwhelmingly elected to a full term the next year.

During her four years in the House of Representatives, Congresswoman Boggs has

sponsored measures in the fields of housing, health, energy research, credit rights and education. While justice for all Americans is her primary interest, she has had a special concern for the advancement of women.

Significant activities in the area of women's rights include votes—in the 93d and 94th Congress:

For the Federal Aid to Education amendments, including Title IX;

Against the Casey amendment which would have weakened Title IX provisions;

For an amendment which allowed women to enter the service academies;

For the Equal Credit Act (which she co-sponsored);

For both the initial passage and override of the National Health Revenue Sharing Bill, which she co-sponsored and which provided for a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape;

For the passage of an override of the School Lunch Amendment which provided for continued support of the Women, Infants and Children feeding program; and

For the Small Business Administration Amendments, which prohibit discrimination against women in the granting of small business loans.

Her current House appointment is a seat on the Appropriations Committee, which is designated an "exclusive committee" requiring resignation from any other committee appointment. Previously, Rep. Boggs served on the Banking and Currency and House Administration committees. The Joint Committee on Bicentennial Arrangements, which she chaired, expired at the end of 1976. Congresswoman Boggs is also a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Democratic Party recognized Lindy Boggs' many contributions in 1976 when she was named Chairwoman of the Democratic National Convention in New York, the first woman to hold that position in the history of major American political conventions.

A number of distinguished institutions have also honored Lindy Boggs for her contributions. She was named one of ten outstanding persons for 1976 by the New Orleans Institute for Human Understanding and was the first recipient of the AMVETS National Auxiliary Humanitarian Award. In 1976, St. Mary's Dominican College of New Orleans awarded her its Distinguished Service Medal, and, in 1975, Trinity College of Washington conferred upon her an honorary doctorate of public service. She has also received the Weiss Memorial Award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Mother Gerard Philan Gold Medal given annually to an outstanding woman by Virginia's Marymount College.

From grass roots organizing to national prominence, Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, an active and dedicated Catholic woman, has served her country with vigor and distinction. It is in recognition of her service and her dedication to justice that I proudly present U.S. Rep. Lindy Boggs as a candidate for an honorary degree from Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College.

PROPOSED AGENCY NOT NEEDED TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, a perceptive article on the proposed Consumer Protection Agency in today's Wall Street Journal points out, quite correctly in my opinion, that the critical issue for

debate is whether or not the taxpayer should be made to support another Federal agency simply because the ones that are already being supported have not fulfilled their legislative mandates. As James G. Reynolds, the vice president of American Bakeries Co., notes, every existing Federal agency was originally charged, in most cases explicitly, with upholding the very "public interest" that the CPA is now supposed to uphold.

Why, if these agencies have failed to perform their functions properly, is it to be expected that a new agency will do any better? What are the structural differences between the CPA and other less rarefied agencies that would suggest that they will succeed where others have failed? Why not reform existing agencies rather than attaching a new one to the Federal bureaucracy? Until some of these questions can be answered satisfactorily, it is incomprehensible to me that Congress could blithely create a new governmental body certain to inflict new burdens upon the people. As Mr. Reynolds aptly puts it—

No organization in possession of even half its senses would conceive of solving such a problem by hiring another permanent staff with authority to advocate the interests of the organization and force the responsible employees to do their jobs properly.

In other words, the whole business of Government is supposedly the public interest. If our elected and appointed officials are not performing properly, replace them. Do not punish the public further by yoking upon them a new body. At this point in the RECORD, I include the full text of Mr. Reynolds' remarks:

PROPOSED AGENCY NOT NEEDED TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

(By James G. Reynolds)

Arguments against a Consumer Protection Agency have largely centered on the practical problems of implementation, i.e., how the agency would determine who is the consumer and how is he to be protected. These arguments are all well and good, but they miss the larger and more fundamental reason why Americans should oppose creation of this agency.

The express purpose of the proposed law, as announced by its sponsors, is to establish a federal agency to represent the interests of the consumer in federal agency proceedings. If the purpose is sound (it rings bells of Catch-22 to me), then the malaise is the failure of federal agencies to perform their legal and constitutional mandates.

In general, each federal agency was created for the express purpose of assuring that transactions which were to be the subject of such agency's power be conducted in the public interest to promote the greatest public justice in an area that might otherwise be subject to abuse if left in unfettered private hands.

This purpose is necessary to justify the birth of a government agency and to support its continued existence at the taxpayers' expense.

Taxpayers and consumers are identical. Tax-paying citizens are the same people who buy goods from businesses regulated by the FTC. What purchaser of securities is not already supposed to be represented by the mandate of the SEC? Is there a consumer of foods and drugs who is not now paying taxes to support a huge FDA staff whose legal duty is to regulate foods and drugs in his interest? The FTC and the FCC are there to assure that utilities and broadcasters provide full, fair and efficient service

under monopolistic conditions. For whose benefit? Consumers. Taxpayers. You and me.

From a tactical point of view it may seem logical to establish a federal agency to represent the consumer in federal agency proceedings. But philosophically, it's wrong. Maybe the agencies aren't doing their jobs. Perhaps they are influenced too much by special interests, and another system is required to channel the special interest of the consumer.

But why are taxpayers being told they need to pay for another agency just because the ones they are already paying for are not fulfilling their legal mandates, their constitutional purposes?

I suggest the people be told that another layer of government is required because the bureaucratic layer is out of control. The people should be told that our administration and our Congress do not know how to solve this problem from within the agencies. We don't know how to constitute our agencies so that they will perform their legal mandates.

The people should be advised that the purpose of this proposed agency is conceptually different from the normal management control functions of auditing and review necessary to assure continued performance by people we believe to be doing a good job right along. The purpose of the new agency is to cause (force) the responsible agency officials to do the job they are already supposed to be doing. The bill approved by the House Government Operations Committee would permit this proposed agency to sue other federal agencies.

It is inconceivable that a private organization would seek to solve a problem in one department by hiring a separate staff to force that department's employees to do their jobs properly. If a breakdown in performance were perceived to be complex or widespread, management might commission an outside group to study the situation.

And suppose this hypothetical outside group were to report that the purchasing department was overly influenced by suppliers bearing Super Bowl tickets, that the finance department was being swayed by bankers bearing low-interest personal loans, that production and engineering staffs were beset by equipment dealers offering free color TVs on the side?

No organization in possession of even half its senses would conceive of solving such a problem by hiring another permanent staff with authority to advocate the interests of the organization and force the responsible employees to do their jobs properly.

The responsible employees in purchasing, for example, know their job is to obtain high quality goods and services at the lowest cost, and to ignore suppliers bearing gifts. If a private organization were to pay people for not performing their jobs and also pay another group to force them to do their jobs, the inevitable result would be the deterioration and eventual ruin of the organization. Maintaining the organization would become too costly, and maintaining employee attitudes and spirit so necessary to continuing vitality would be impossible in light of management's acquiescence to large-scale non-performance.

Federal agencies are no different. Responsible agency employees know their jobs and their duties. The administration and the Congress, through existing offices and monitoring committees, should force the agencies to perform their duties in the first instance through proper budgeting, auditing, performance standards review and by firing people who are not doing their jobs properly.

Or have the federal agencies become so large, cumbersome and otherwise entrenched that we have several very expensive, uncontrollable monsters on our hands? Are matters so irreversible that what we really need for effective control is a regulatory advocacy

agency to regulate the regulators? And in due time, who regulates the regulatory advocacy agency?

The Consumer Protection Agency is wrong, not so much for what it would try to do, but because it admits to an incurable state of affairs within our government. We cannot as a nation afford to support a government that cannot control itself.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COAL SUBSTITUTION INCENTIVE ACT OF 1977

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1977, we will be spending at least \$38 billion for foreign oil. We must do so in order to keep our cars moving, our industry and utilities operating, and our homes warm and lighted. The most oft-quoted statistic, concerning our energy situation, stresses our growing dependence on imports which now exceed 40 percent of our total domestic oil demand.

It has become increasingly clear to the American people that such dependence is fraught with economic danger. The threat of increased prices and a restoration of the embargo, and all they imply in terms of economic disruption, are problems with which this Congress must deal. Indeed, in his energy message of April 29, President Carter pointed out in stark terms the degree of our commitment to oil and gas with which to operate our society, and equally so, our definite need to reduce such dependence as fast and as complete as the transition to other energy sources will permit.

For the record, it is important to note that industry and utilities used 4.8 million barrels of oil per day, and 5.9 million barrels of oil equivalent per day, in the form of natural gas, in 1976. The rate of consumption will probably be even higher this year. Both resources are, however, scarce in availability. Moreover, both are needed by other elements of our economy to as great a degree as industry and the utilities represent. For that reason alone, it makes eminent good sense to promote conversion to other energy forms as quickly as possible. This can be done by turning to more abundant sources such as coal, which makes up 90 percent of our conventional energy reserves, but supplies only 18 percent of our energy consumed.

Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves how we can proceed to increase the demand for the use of our coal resources. Certainly, we should do all we can to remove those constraints which have held back such demand for this energy source in the past.

Mr. Speaker, one such constraint has been the obvious cost incurred by the user to meet necessary environmental standards, particularly those involving direct burning. The Clean Air Act of 1970 established high air quality requirements. The Edison Electric Institute has estimated the cost to utilities to be at

least \$1.7 billion annually to meet those standards. These are imposing figures, but if we are to shift from oil- and gas-fired systems to those based on coal, it is clear to me that we must also provide suitable incentives and assistance to industry in its quest to accomplish such a massive undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I am introducing the Coal Substitution Incentive Act of 1977.

This bill, if enacted, would provide up to \$500 million annually in loan guarantees and \$100 million in low interest loans to companies shifting from oil and gas to coal. The funds made available would be for the acquisition of pollution control systems.

The legislation foresees a 10-year conversion effort, thus, the limits of these incentives could be \$5 billion in guarantees and \$1 billion in loans.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, I have devoted considerable effort to the review and examination of loan guarantees as forms of credit assistance, and as a means of reallocating our resources. This legislation I introduce today incorporates all of the acknowledged safeguards identified by our efforts that are intended to minimize the risk of Federal revenue loss should any default occur.

Mr. Speaker, President Carter has told us our energy problem has taken decades to grow, and may take decades to solve. I believe we can move toward that solution only if we recognize the nature of our problem, and only if we begin the task of its solution today. The equation is quite simple: We must reduce foreign oil and gas imports, and we must increase the use of our own resources. Our most abundant substitute is coal. I believe there is widespread support for incentives to go to coal substitution, and I believe that loans and loan guarantees should be considered in the range of incentives to be adopted.

PRESIDENT CARTER: HARD-NOSED WITH FARMERS—SOFT-NOSED WITH FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture this morning began the markup of a food stamp bill which is to become part of the farm bill (H.R. 7171) when the latter is considered on the floor of the House. Congressman JAMES JOHNSON of Colorado offered an amendment to the food stamp bill which incorporated a provision contained in the Carter administration food stamp proposal forwarded to the Congress and printed by the Senate as a committee print on April 15, 1977.

This administration provision on standard deductions—offered by Mr. JOHNSON—would have saved \$103 million in food stamp expenditures in fiscal year 1978.

The administration-Johnson proposal

included a \$80 standard deduction, but it did not include a separate shelter deduction or a separate child care deduction—as does the food stamp bill before the committee—because the standard deduction itself incorporates costs for these two items.

Secretary Bergland in testifying before the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition, chaired by Congressman RICHMOND of New York, on April 5, 1977, had great praise for the Carter administration's food stamp proposal:

I come before you today with a major reform proposal. It is designed to tighten up the program, to eliminate or reduce benefits to the households with the highest incomes, to reduce errors, and to curb possibilities for abuse.

In addition, this proposal will vastly simplify and streamline the program. Finally, our proposal is designed to increase access to the program by those most in need.

Two, we would also place firm gross income limits on the program by replacing the many complicated itemized deductions in the current program with two simple standard deductions—a deduction of \$80 for all households, plus a deduction for working families in the amount of 20 percent of earned income to compensate for taxes, other mandatory deductions from salary, and work expenses.

Our new proposed legislation, which we will present to the committee within the next two days so that it can be incorporated as a title of the farm bill, is over 30 pages in length, and, in preparing it, we scrutinized all aspects of this program's operation.

I turn now to measures to simplify the program. First, standard deductions. As I mentioned previously, the Department is proposing to substitute two basic, simple standard deductions in place of the current itemized deductions.

This will greatly simplify administration of the program, and will also reduce errors. About 30 percent of all errors now stem from errors in determining the proper level of itemized deductions.

In addition, the time now used in calculating itemized deductions can be spent in the more important area of verifying income. This should further reduce errors.

I should note that the various aspects of our proposal cannot be divorced from each other. Our income limits and standard deductions reduce costs by over \$400 million a year, and balance off most or all of the cost of providing benefits to the new participants who enter the program due to the elimination of the purchase requirement.

If our income limit and standard deduction proposals are not adopted and higher eligibility and benefit levels are substituted in their place, then the cost of the food stamp program will increase in a manner that is unacceptable to this Administration.

In the consideration of the Johnson amendment today, Mr. Robert Greenstein, special assistant to Secretary Bergland, after supporting the administration's \$80 standard deduction proposal on April 5, 1977, indicated that the Carter administration could accept the more costly—by \$103 million—provision in the committee bill:

Mr. Greenstein, special assistant to Secretary Bergland:

In working on the food stamp proposal, we did not have a great deal of time as a new administration. Actually at one point very near submission of the bill to the Congress, the Secretary sent a proposal to the White House that included a shelter allowance and a child care deduction. Then after some con-

sideration, we went with the \$80 standard deduction. It was a close call on our part.

There were a couple of things that we were not aware of at that point. We did not until after the bill came out have the figure that there were over 700,000 households that lost over \$20 a month in benefits under our bill.

When the shelter allowance and the child care deduction began to get some support and we heard they were coming up, we had internal discussions with the White House and other agencies, and the general Administration position was that we were not going to be extremely hard-nosed about this—that we could live with the shelter approach, provided that it remained within the general cost frame that the Administration came up with. That was the real concern, as I said during the Subcommittee markup. When these issues came up again, the cost was one of our concerns.

Now the Congressional Budget Office figures indicate that due to the shelter deduction, etc., that the Subcommittee bill is about \$45 million more costly than the Administration proposal during its first year. However, the CBO figures also indicate that by the third year, the costs are roughly the same and that by the fourth year, the Subcommittee bill is actually less expensive and cheaper than the Administration proposal.

So we find the general costs of the overall package of the bill to be indeed within the cost frame the Administration has provided. And that being the case, we really should live with the Subcommittee approach, and we really do not have a strong position one way or the other.

At the same time Mr. Greenstein was testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture and stating that the Carter administration would not be hard-nosed—in fact, would be “soft-nosed”—about the \$103 million additional costs of the committee's shelter and child care deductions, President Carter was holding a press conference at the White House threatening a veto of the farm bill.

It is clear that President Carter is going to be hard-nosed in giving help to the farmers—but “soft-nosed” and generous to strikers and other individuals who receive food stamps.

In October 1976, in Wichita, Kans., Vice President MONDALE was campaigning and criticizing President Ford and his vetoes of farm bills and claiming that “Even those—wheat loans—at \$2.75 are too low.”

Vice President MONDALE also said at that time that if elected:

I will tell you who runs the Department of Agriculture fundamentally—it is the President.

Well, President Carter—the real Secretary of Agriculture—as Vice President MONDALE apparently refers to him—has made it clear who he is going to be hard-nosed with during his administration. It is the farmer. Perhaps when our wheat farmers go broke and get in the food stamp lines, they will start getting some “soft-nosed” generous treatment from President Carter.

WASHINGTON'S UNCIVIL SERVANTS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker once again die-hard advocates of the measure

to allow the politicizing of government employees are trying to pass H.R. 10.

Nicholas von Hoffman the reputable card-carrying liberal takes a look at the repeal of the Hatch Act of his column appearing in the May 21 Chicago Tribune. I insert his article in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members from the other side of the aisle:

WASHINGTON'S UNCIVIL SERVANTS

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—Under the label of reform, a bill repealing most of the Hatch Act is making its way through Congress toward the Oval Office where the President has said he'll sign it. Oddly enough, the Hatch Act, which prohibits government employees from taking part in partisan, electoral politics, was considered a reform measure when it was passed in 1939.

Its purpose was to prevent a President from using the large numbers of recently hired government employees as campaign workers. The Roosevelt administration was often accused of winning elections via this route, but national administrations weren't set up to run huge battalions of campaign workers at the precinct level; unless the patronage could be turned over to state and local officials it was not very useful for winning elections.

Despite his enemies' accusations, FDR didn't try this use of federal employees so he had no trouble living with the Hatch Act. In actuality, the law was superfluous because the protections and job securities afforded by the civil service robbed politicians of the weapons of coercion to make employees into campaign workers. How can you force a postal clerk to work for Gruntz for President if the clerk knows you can't fire him?

In the years after the passage of the Hatch Act, electoral politics underwent a change. In the language of economics it swung from being labor intensive to capital intensive. The costly armies of precinct workers were replaced by television campaigning, which allows a candidate to reach more people per dollar spent than the knock-on-the-door method. Thus it's questionable these federal employees would have been used by presidential incumbents even if there had been no law.

Nevertheless, the Hatch Act has been accomplishing another unintended good. If the political use of federal employees by Presidents was never likely, the use of the same employees by labor unions is a much more real possibility.

Without the right to strike or take part in political campaigns, federal employees are already among the highest paid in the country. Without a Hatch Act they would have long since extorted the right to strike from Congress and along with it even greater advantages in pay, pensions, and other fringe benefits. That's not mere supposition, as the record of the county and municipal workers' unions attests.

When public employees are given the right to strike, as well as the right to engage in partisan political activity, there is delivered into their hands a combination of levers no other group of workers gets.

The members of the automobile workers union can strike to enforce their wage demands, but what would the price of cars look like if the union could also participate in the election of the auto manufacturers' boards of directors?

In addition, for many years public employees have had to negotiate with a pussy cat management; to wit, public officials who weren't spending their own money when they voted wage increases and productivity decreases.

In the last few years the pussy cats have stiffened somewhat because the rest of organized labor, the part that works in the private sector, has gotten so angry. The repeal of the Hatch Act, however, will make

it more difficult to keep government salaries in line with those of the rest of the world.

That may be the least of it. It is already close to impossible to fire a government employee because of the civil service. People on the public payroll are given, by law, greater security and tenure than workers in the private sector can get through collective bargaining. Now, by repeal of the Hatch Act, civil service employees will get so much more protection, and all coercive power to make them work will have been de facto abolished.

Repeal of the Hatch Act will demolish any good that may come from Jimmy Carter's zero-based budgeting or contemplated departmental reorganizations. It doesn't make any difference if a federal program is good or bad in concept if it is to be administered by a bureaucracy in which all supervisory control over the employees has been extinguished or attenuated to the point that the civil servants can be as abusively arrogant to their nominal bosses as they are already to the various publics they make wait in the endless lines of weary and frustrated people stretching out of every government office in America.

The lowest price that should be exacted for the repeal of the Hatch Act is a repeal of the Civil Service Act. Instead, President Carter will sign the measure proclaiming as he does that this is the political emancipation of the enslaved bureaucrats. But the first time he tries to put this creaking government to some good and efficient use, they'll thank him by shoving their fists down his mouth.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION: A MEXICAN VIEWPOINT

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I have, as my colleagues know, held a deep interest in the problem of illegal immigration to this country. As time passes, it becomes increasingly clear that the root of the problem is not what is happening in this country, but what is happening in the sender countries. It does not matter whether we patrol our borders more thoroughly, or whether we institute criminal, or even civil, sanctions against employers of undocumented workers, and it will not matter whether we institute forgeproof methods of identification. Until we begin actively to work with the leaders of other countries, and direct our aid programs in positive job-producing industries in those countries, people will continue to seek economic opportunity in the United States.

An article by Alan Riding in this morning's New York Times vividly points this position up through an interview with Dr. Jorge A. Bustamante, one of Mexico's outstanding authorities on illegal immigration. Dr. Bustamante echoes the position of those of us who feel that the current direction of American immigration policy will only exacerbate an already critical situation. I commend this article to you:

MEXICAN SAYS UNITED STATES INVITES DISASTER ON ILLEGAL ALIENS

(By Alan Riding)

MEXICO CITY, May 25.—Mexico's leading expert on illegal migration to the United States has sharply criticized the Carter Administration's plans for dealing with the problem and has warned that its “myopic policy” could

bring disastrous consequences for both the United States and Mexico.

"The United States is looking at illegal Mexican migration as if it were simply a domestic problem," said Dr. Jorge A. Bustamante, an academic who has advised successive Mexican governments on the problem. "The Carter Administration isn't even considering the impact of its unilateral decision on our economy, on our levels of unemployment and, above all, on the border regions."

Although President Carter has still to announce his policy toward illegal migration, it is expected to include an amnesty for illegal aliens with several years' residence in the United States, new legislation to penalize employers of illegal aliens and a strengthening of the border patrol to stem the flow of Mexicans slipping into the United States.

The six-month-old Government of President José López Portillo has so far withheld comment on the American plans, but the issue was believed to have been discussed at a meeting in Washington today between the Mexican Foreign Minister, Santiago Roel, and Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance.

In an interview, the 39-year-old Dr. Bustamante, a researcher at the Colegio de México, warned that any amnesty for illegal aliens in the United States would encourage hundreds of thousands more Mexicans to go north in search of employment. At the same time, he said, the Carter Administration's plan to bolster the border patrol and fine employers of illegal aliens would push the Mexican migrants back toward the 2,000-mile-long border.

Dr. Bustamante's fear is that such a policy would not only aggravate Mexico's economic problems but would also create a vast army of restive unemployed in the overcrowded and run-down Mexican border towns, spawning huge new slums and feeding the crime and violence that have already become serious problems.

"The phenomenon of social chaos in the border towns could bring a backlash on the American side and affect the broad spectrum of our bilateral relations, and it could well produce a wave of repression on both sides of the border," he said.

MOOD OF HOSTILITY NOTED

The population of Mexico's border towns has doubled to three million over the last 15 years, with most of the inhabitants living in shantytowns within one mile of the United States. The rapid and chaotic growth of the towns is expected to continue as unemployment in Mexico drives growing numbers to seek jobs in or near the United States.

Dr. Bustamante, who six years ago crossed into the United States as an illegal alien as part of his research into the problem, recognized that President Carter is under great pressure from organized labor to tackle the issue.

"There is a growing mood of hostility toward Mexican migrants," he noted. "All this talk of a 'silent invasion' has helped Americans associate such problems as unemployment, taxation and crime with illegal aliens. People are increasingly convinced that the Mexican migration is an evil that has to be eradicated."

"It's all so simple," he went on. "There are 6.7 million Americans out of work and they say there are six million illegal Mexicans in the U.S., so get rid of the Mexicans and you've got rid of unemployment."

But Dr. Bustamante insists that the Carter Administration's response to the problem is based on false premises. He believes that there are not six million to eight million Mexicans in the United States illegally but many fewer and that most illegal aliens are not taking jobs away from Americans but doing low-paid menial work that Americans refuse to do.

THIRTEEN INDICTED IN TEXAS BANKING CASE

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, last year, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation, and Insurance conducted an extensive investigation and hearings into the collapse of the Citizens State Bank of Carrizo Springs, Tex., and the various "control groups" which operate widely in Texas banking circles.

These hearings and related investigation have given us an important insight into the manner in which banks are bought and sold and milked for the benefit of their temporary ownership-control groups. The hearings produced evidence of classic patterns of insider lending and manipulation as well as a new look at Federal and State regulation of banks.

Last week, a Federal grand jury in San Antonio, Tex., indicted 13 persons in connection with the Citizens State Bank case. It is my understanding that this Federal grand jury is continuing its investigation and undoubtedly we will be hearing more of this case in the coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the RECORD at this point three articles from the Dallas Morning News outlining the indictments and other aspects of this ongoing case:

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 21, 1977]

THIRTEEN INDICTED IN ALLEGED BANK SCHEME (By Stewart Davis)

SAN ANTONIO.—A federal grand jury indicted 13 persons Friday for their alleged roles in what investigators have termed the Texas "rent-a-bank" scheme.

The 49-count indictment charges 12 of the defendants with "reckless disregard" for the best interest of Citizens State Bank of Carrizo Springs, which was closed June 28, 1976, when \$3.5 million in bad loans were discovered.

Thirty-six loans involving \$1,912,800 are identified in the indictment as misapplications of bank funds.

Indicted were:

Enrique M. Salinas of Eagle Pass, director and majority stockholder when the bank collapsed. FBI agents were seeking to arrest and hold him on \$100,000 bond.

Gretchen Salinas, his wife, owner and operator of Galeria Inc. gift shop in Eagle Pass. Her bond was set at \$50,000, with release authorized on her personal recognizance.

Lewis Woodul of Cotulla, farmer, rancher and former president of the bank.

Dan Sanchez Jr. of Encinal, farmer and former co-chairman of the board at the bank.

Attilano de la Garza, a rancher from Del Rio and Muzquez, Mexico.

Luis E. Salinas, brother of Enrique Salinas, who is a Mexican citizen with an Eagle Pass address.

Ron Guess of San Antonio, former executive vice-president of the bank.

Blanca Alicia de Aldaco of Eagle Pass, reportedly a cousin of Enrique Salinas.

Bicknell Eubanks, II, U.S. customs inspector from Eagle Pass, identified in testimony before a U.S. congressional subcommittee as

the recipient of a loan from the bank used to purchase an airplane for Enrique's brother. Urban Farrow of Carrizo Springs, former chairman of the bank board.

Jesus Davis of Eagle Pass and foreman of De la Garza's ranch at Muzquez, Mexico.

Jose L. Flores of Eagles Pass and Monterrey, Mexico, owner of an insurance agency and Salinas' brother-in-law.

Richard George of Carrizo Springs, president of the bank before its takeover by Salinas.

Five of the defendants had been arrested late Friday. They are George, Farrow, Eubanks, De Aldaco and Guess. Two were released. Urban Farrow was released on \$50,000 personal recognizance bond, and Richard George posted a \$50,000 cash security bond.

The "rent-a-bank" phrase was used by investigators to describe the practice of bank "control groups" buying into banks and allegedly using bank assets for insider loans and other abuses.

Another state bank subsequently folded in Rio Grande City, another South Texas town, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has reported 60 "problem banks" in Texas, with some 35 of them having serious difficulties.

U.S. Attorney John E. Clark of San Antonio said the indictments were the first to result from a federal-state probe of South Texas banking practices that began last July after the collapse at Citizens State.

Clark said the indictments represent the end of the first phase of the inquiry. He indicated additional indictments would be issued against other people within two or three months.

Maximum penalties for the offenses charged range from five years in prison and \$10,000 fine on the alleged conspiracies and five years' imprisonment and \$5,000 for misapplication of bank funds and making false entries in bank records.

Salinas faced a total of 41 counts, his wife, 4, and Woodul faced 30 counts. The others were indicted on one to five counts. All except George, were charged with conspiracy. George was accused of disbursing a \$39,000 loan from which he benefitted personally.

The conspiracy accusation lists Enrique Salinas' late brother, Juan Salinas, as an undisciplined co-conspirator, along with Alex Short, his secretary, died in a mysterious plane crash on De la Garza's ranch.

Nance, vice-president of the bank when Salinas took control, was a key witness in congressional subcommittee hearings into the Texas bank situation last fall. U.S. Atty. Clark refused to comment on what role Nance might play in the defendants' trial, which under federal speedy trial procedures might come up this summer.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 22, 1977]

INDICTMENTS NEXT CHAPTER IN BANK'S COLLAPSE

(By Stewart Davis)

SAN ANTONIO.—Enrique M. Salinas, 35, who pyramided a financial statement and Mexican ranchland into a 6-bank empire, was in Uvalde County jail Saturday, accused of conspiring to drain bank assets through his family and friends.

Salinas' empire of bank holdings collapsed when Citizens State Bank of Carrizo Springs was closed June 28, 1976, with \$3.5 million in "bad" loans, about \$2 million of that amount to him, relatives and associates.

Joseph E. O'Connell, FBI special agent in charge here, said Salinas and Salinas' wife, Gretchen Bentley Salinas, voluntarily surrendered to FBI agents at 10:30 p.m. Friday and were still in custody, awaiting arraignment before the U.S. magistrate at Del Rio.

Salinas was held in lieu of \$100,000 bond.

His wife was held in lieu of \$50,000 bond, subject to release on personal recognition by the magistrate.

Eleven others were indicted by a federal grand jury here, along with Salinas and his wife, for their alleged roles in what is known as a Texas "rent-a-bank" scheme, which consists of "control groups" gaining controlling interest in banks with borrowed money, then using bank assets for insider loans.

Five of the others were arrested, and two were released on bonds.

Salinas' group consisted of his brother, Juan, who died in a plane crash in Mexico a week before the bank closed, another brother, Luis, a Mexican citizen indicted in the alleged conspiracy, and Ron Guess of San Antonio, a financial adviser to Salinas and president of Maverick Air Inc. Charter Service, also indicted.

Salinas' group purchased Citizens State Bank from another group, headed by Ron Bramble, Willard Mertz financial consultants from San Antonio, and Dr. James Bauerle, a San Antonio oral surgeon and University of Texas regent.

The indictment named Salinas' late brother, Juan, as a co-conspirator but not as a defendant.

The federal allegation contends the conspiracy to milk funds from Citizens State Bank started with the naming of two Salinas associates, Lewis Woodul and Dan Sanchez Jr. (both indicted) as president and vice-chairman of the bank board, respectively. At the time, Salinas was borrowing about \$600,000 from Alamo National Bank of San Antonio to take ownership at Citizens State Bank.

Thereafter, the indictment spells out, the principals and their associates engaged in 36 loan transactions involving \$1,219,800 in purportedly legitimate loans which were improperly granted, totally or incompletely secured and granted with "reckless disregard" for the best interest of the bank.

Salinas was the main beneficiary in most cases, with relatives and associates receiving some of the funds, the indictment claims.

Urban Farrow, 73, president of the bank for 20 years until 1974 and one of those indicted, said after his release on bond in the case, that he signed for a \$67,500 loan on Jan. 6, 1976, as "an accommodation" to Salinas, who he said told him he needed the financial help for only a "few days."

Farrow denied he was part of any conspiracy, and he claimed handling of the entire Citizens State Bank closing by FDIC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) officials and State Banking Commissioner Robert Stewart was "strange."

"There's no question," Farrow said in an interview, "from the moment they came in for the (bank examination, they had their hatchets in their hands."

He explained he felt the authorities never gave Salinas an adequate opportunity to obtain the funds necessary to cover the questionable loans discovered during bank examinations.

Salinas also contended in testimony before a U.S. congressional subcommittee hearing into the matter last year that he was the victim of prejudiced authorities.

Salinas contended he personally lost about \$3 million or \$4 million when the closure of Citizens State Bank led to foreclosure on the loans with which he had acquired control of Union State Bank of Carrizo Springs (which is in Dimmit County, South Texas), Security State Bank of McCamey (Upton County, West Texas), First Bank of Coppel (Dallas County), Comfort State Bank (Kendall County, Central Texas) and First National Bank of Anderson (Grimes County, East Texas).

Salinas claimed he obtained control of Citizens State to protect his cash deposits there.

Salinas was unavailable to comment on his indictment.

Others indicted by the federal grand jury in the alleged scheme include Atilano de la Garza, a rancher from Del Rio and Mexico; Blanca Alicia de Aldaco, a cousin of Salinas from Eagle Pass; Bicknell Eubanks III, a U.S. Customs inspector from Eagle Pass and Jesus Davis, a ranch foreman for De la Garza.

Also indicted separately was Richard George, president of Citizens State Bank prior to the takeover by the Salinas group. He was charged with converting a \$39,000 loan to his personal use, even though the loan was in the name of another person.

An example of the type of insider loans alleged by the indictment is a \$25,000 advance to Galeria Inc., an antique and jewelry gift shop operated by Gretchen Salinas in Eagle Pass.

The indictment claims the loan was not well secured and that the gift shop was not entitled to the bank's credit because no credit report on Galeria had been obtained, no collateral was pledged for the loan, no deed of trust was pledged to the bank and no verified financial statement of Galeria was obtained, all in violation of federal law.

In another case, customs agent Eubanks was alleged to have obtained a \$40,000 loan for an aircraft, without a lien on the plane ever given to the bank as collateral. The indictment alleged the plane wasn't worth \$40,000 and Eubanks never filed a verified financial statement.

Testimony to the congressional subcommittee examining questionable Texas bank activities showed the loan was used to purchase a plane for the use of Luis Salinas, Enrique's brother, because Luis, a Mexican national, was not eligible to own a plane with United States registry.

FDIC reports to the congressional subcommittee indicated possibly widespread banking abuses, including "control groups" and abusive banking practices that placed up to 60 Texas banks on a "problem" list.

About eight or nine "control groups" have been identified for scrutiny by government officials.

U.S. Atty. John Clark of San Antonio said additional indictments will be issued in a couple of months, naming others in the alleged abuse of legal banking practices.

Clark's year-long inquiry into the banking situation has been assisted by Texas Assistant Atty. Gen. John Blanton, on assignment as a special assistant U.S. attorney. Clark described cooperation from Atty. Gen. John Hill's office as excellent, and Clark cited other state and federal agencies for their assistance and cooperation in the probe.

Assistant U.S. Atty. W. Ray John headed the federal portion of the grand jury's investigation.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 21, 1977]

CHARGES SPAWNED BY BANK COLLAPSE

SAN ANTONIO.—The indictment of 13 South Texans Friday is another in a series of ripples from the collapse last summer of Citizens State Bank in Carrizo Springs.

Closing of Citizens State has resulted in: Hearings last fall by the subcommittee on financial institutions of the U.S. House Banking, Currency and Housing Committee, aimed at remedial legislation and congressional oversight of regulatory enforcement agencies.

State legislative passage, upon Gov. Dolph Briscoe's recommendation, of a statute designed to screen new owners who buy 25 per cent or more of a bank's stock, thus becoming a "control group."

Grand jury probes in San Antonio and Dallas-Fort Worth.

Investigations by a myriad of governmental agencies, including the Justice Department, the Texas attorney general, the FBI, the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal

Home Loan Bank Board into the affairs of an assortment of banks, savings associations, insurance companies, government agencies and private firms and individuals.

Citizens State was closed by State Banking Commissioner Robert Stewart when bad loans totaled \$3.5 million.

Some of those loans were cited in the federal grand jury indictments filed here Friday, alleging a conspiracy to defraud the bank.

The indictment claims Enrique M. Salinas, whose ownership of five Texas banks disintegrated upon the collapse of Citizens State, obtained control of Citizens State Bank and put Lewis Woodul in as president and Dan Sanchez Jr. as director.

The indictment contends Woodul and Sanchez misapplied bank money in the form of numerous loans to the other accused "purporting to be legitimate loans made in the ordinary course of banking, but which were in truth and fact improperly granted, improperly secured or totally unsecured and granted with a reckless disregard for the best interest of the said Citizens State Bank."

The charge goes on to say that the proceeds of the loans were converted to the personal use of Salinas and other members of the group, exceeding the legal loan limit of the bank.

The alleged conspiracy was accomplished, the indictment said, through numerous false and fraudulent entries in the bank books as a coverup of the true nature of the loans and "to deceive the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and agents and examiners appointed to examine the affairs of the bank."

The indictment also alleged the conspiracy included such actions as making the bank records reflect legitimate loans so that the accused could sell a share of those transactions to other financial institutions, thereby obtaining additional funds from other financial institutions "to disburse to and among themselves..."

Bank certificates of deposit were issued, the indictment claimed, which had not been paid for, and these certificates were pledged for loans at other financial institutions.

Further, the indictment claims some of the accused gave immediate credit to checks drawn on foreign banks by the accused, even though in some instances the checks were never honored.

The indictment then describes each of 36 loans for \$1.9 million alleged to be misapplications of bank money.

Salinas testified under oath to the congressional subcommittee last fall that he may have been the victim of bank control groups that sold to him. He contended he was using family wealth from Mexican ranch lands to go into the banking business in Texas.

Salinas, 35, formerly a school teacher in Eagle Pass, said he lost several million dollars personally when his control of six Texas banks was lost as lienholders foreclosed.

THE FARM UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS BILL

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has passed a great many laws providing economic aid and stimulus to State and local governments. We have appropriated funds for public works jobs, CETA, community development projects, revenue sharing, and a host of other programs. I wholeheartedly support the concept behind returning these funds to the localities, but I am deeply concerned about

the unjust manner in which these funds are being distributed.

We have not given due consideration to the ways in which many of those laws discriminate against people in rural areas as a result of the fact that their distribution is based entirely or partially on unemployment statistics that do not accurately reflect the economy in rural areas. Congress chose those statistics as a basis for distributing Federal funds largely because it has been assumed that employment means earnings and, therefore, buying power—and that buying power reflects economic conditions in a given area. On the surface, these statistics may seem to provide a nationwide common denominator, but it does not hold true in rural areas because they do not reflect one of the most basic components of the rural economy: the buying power of the farmer.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics does not really know how to deal with the occupation of farming. Because farmers are always "working" in the traditional sense of the word, they are always counted as "employed," and are therefore included when the total civilian labor force is calculated. However, they never show up in the unemployment statistics, regardless of whether or not they are "earning money" in the sense of having cash to put back into rural businesses. The economic health of those rural businesses is vitally dependent on the financial condition of the farmers in the area—yet severely depressed farm earnings and the resulting depressed earnings in local businesses do not show up in the statistics by which we are supposedly measuring the area's need for economic assistance. My district's farmers lost over \$50 million last year because of drought, but the unemployment rate stayed between 2 and 4 percent. Because of the way the BLS definitions weight the scales, those statistics are a distortion of the true situation. Clearly, the economy in those rural communities needs help, but because we refuse to acknowledge the different nature of those economies, the needs of rural people are being ignored.

This situation can have devastating effects on rural areas by forcing the mobile members of small communities to move to the urban and suburban areas where unemployment statistics are high enough to rate Federal jobs programs. This exodus of small businessmen and wage earners will result in the erosion of the local tax base as town revenues become dependent on senior citizens with fixed incomes and lower income people who are unable to relocate in the urban centers. This will add impetus to the downward spiral of the local economy as the repercussions are felt in local school systems and community services dependent on local taxes. By ignoring the interrelationship between local farm income and the well-being of the rural economy as a whole, we are contributing to the erosion of the rural way of life.

It is time for Congress to strengthen rural communities—not add to the pressures that turn them into ghost towns. If we continue to distribute Federal assistance inequitably between urban and rural areas, rural citizens will be compelled to flock to wherever the jobs are

being created. This will only compound the unemployment problem in cities and urban dependency upon the Federal Government will only grow as welfare rolls and unemployment assistance payments increase.

We must acknowledge the fact that farming falls into an employment category entirely different from most other occupations in this country. Farmers cannot control the weather, and "working" 365 days a year to bring in good crops does not necessarily mean the market price will allow them to recover their cost of producing those crops. Some people argue that "those are just the risks of farming and they have to be accepted"—and we will be arguing that issue here on the floor in the near future as we consider the farm bill—but the economic impact on the rural economy when farmers have no cash to spend at local businesses cannot be denied.

On the whole, unemployment statistics provide a relatively acceptable reflection of buying power in urban areas where most labor is compensated by wages or salaries. The challenge, then, is to provide a means whereby low buying power is adequately reflected in rural areas. I believe my proposal provides a workable compromise. It is based on recognition of the fact that when an individual whose sole occupation is farming reported a net farm loss for a given tax year, his "income" situation is roughly equivalent to "unemployment" for someone who normally works for wages or a salary. Neither has much income to put back into the rural economy. In fact, the farmer is usually deeply in debt since he has to borrow money to put in the next year's crop. And because the adult members of his family who also work on that farm are also dependent on the farm's net income, they, too, are economically equivalent to "unemployed."

I am proposing that the Bureau of Labor Statistics be required to compile statistics on these individuals with the assistance of the Internal Revenue Service, and that they be included in the unemployment statistics on which distribution of Federal assistance is based.

When we weigh the need for economic stimulus and support in urban and rural areas, we should make sure the scales are not unfairly weighted at the outset. I hope my colleagues will recognize the justice in my proposal and support it.

NATURALIZATION CEREMONIES— FEBRUARY 22, 1977

HON. THOMAS A. LUKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LUKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the text of a speech given by my constituent, Dr. Nicholas J. Tapay, at naturalization ceremonies on George Washington's birthday, February 22, 1977.

Dr. Tapay was born in Hungary and has been a naturalized citizen since 1962. In June 1951 when he was a senior medical student in Budapest, he was deported

with his family to a labor camp in eastern Hungary because his father was a professional army officer of the prewar regime. In November 1951, Dr. Tapay was released from the camp to finish his medical studies, but his family was left behind in camp for 2 more years.

On November 1, 1956, during Hungary's fight for freedom, Dr. Tapay became the youngest member of the Council of Cegled. In December of the same year, he escaped to the West and came to the United States on February 26, 1957.

From 1957 to 1962, Dr. Tapay trained in Cincinnati and in Kansas City as a pediatrician. After becoming a citizen in 1962, he has been practicing medicine in College Hill in my district. Dr. Tapay is a past president of the American-Hungarian Society of Cincinnati.

I think you will enjoy, as I have, Dr. Tapay's profound appreciation for our country and the principles upon which it was founded:

GREETINGS TO THE NEW CITIZENS ON GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Your Honor Judge Porter, Dear New Fellow Citizens and Friends: It is indeed a great honor for me to participate in this festive occasion and greet you as new citizens of the United States. For a naturalized citizen like me, it is certainly an exceptional privilege to have an opportunity to do this today, February 22nd, on the birthday of the father of our country. As we gather here today, enjoying the spiritual and material achievements of 200 years of independence let us go back for a few minutes in memory to those times when this nation was created. It was created by a conscious act of men who set as fundamental goals for their country liberty, justice, equality and progress. These were almost unheard ideals in the political reality of the 18th century and it is no wonder that it took a revolutionary war to establish these ideals as guiding principles for a functioning political system. It was exactly these ideals of the founding fathers which made America so unique among the nations of the world. They attracted and still attract people from all over the world since they express basic, simple but long suppressed human aspirations. I'm sure they had much to do with your decision too as you were planning to leave the old country and settle in a new one. We Americans owe probably no one more for what has been achieved than George Washington who so conscientiously guarded these ideals during his 2 terms as this nation's first president.

When in his kind invitation Judge Porter reminded me that this day would be actually Washington's birthday, although officially it was observed yesterday, I thought it most appropriate to do a little research into his speeches, proclamations and writings and present you with a few of his thoughts. In doing so I will quote him a few times. For the sake of easier understanding please permit me to substitute modern English for some of his archaic words.

How did he envision the functioning of our government?

He most humbly offered his prayers "to enable us all, whether in public or private positions, to perform our duties properly and punctually; to render our national government a blessing to all the people, by being a government of wise and just and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed."

The need to hear a wide range of opinions in the political life of the nation was interpreted by him in the wisest way when he

said: "A difference of opinion on political matters is not to be charged to free men as a fault, since it is to be presumed that they are all caused by an equally laudable and sacred regard for the liberty of their country."²

What a far cry this is from the attempt of many political systems today to unnaturally unify the political expression of a citizenry and claim it as the "will of the people".

He felt that there are 2 factors essential for the internal stability of a country—free elections and an informed electorate.

"... it remains for the citizens of the US to show the world that the accusation that republican governments are not stable is without foundation, when that government is the deliberate choice of an enlightened people."³

In his political philosophy the role of the government and the leaders was beautifully summarized when he stated: "Government being, among other purposes, instituted to protect the persons and consciences of men from oppression, it certainly is the duty of rulers not only to abstain oppression themselves, but also to prevent it in others."⁴

He took justifiably great pride in religious liberty already established: "In this enlightened age and in this land of equal liberty, it is our boast that a man's religious tenets will not forfeit the protection of the laws, nor deprive him of the right of attaining and holding the highest offices that are known in the US."⁵

He defined as the sources of national and personal happiness: "Your love of liberty, your respect for the laws, your industriousness and your practice of the moral and religious obligations are the strongest claims to national and individual happiness, and they will, I trust, be firmly and lastingly established."⁶

He summarized the essence of his foreign policy as follows: "... my foreign policy has been to cultivate peace with all the world; to observe treaties with pure and absolute faith; to check every deviation from the line of impartiality; to explain what may have been misapprehended and correct what may have been injurious to any nation, and having thus acquired the right ... to insist upon justice to ourselves."⁷

For me, who 20 years ago had to risk my life to reach the sanctuary of the free world, it is amazing how he foresaw this country as the asylum for political refugees. In one of his Thanksgiving proclamations he asked the Almighty: "... to render this country more and more a safe and proper asylum for the unfortunate of other countries."⁸

In perspective he saw the role of this nation as follows:

"The virtue, moderation and patriotism, which marked the steps of the American people in framing, adopting and thus far carrying into effect our present system of government, have excited the admiration of nations; it is only up to us to uphold these principles, that we may gain respect abroad and insure happiness to ourselves and our children. It should be the highest ambition of every American to extend his views beyond himself and to bear in mind that his conduct will not only affect himself, his country and his next generation, but that its influence may be felt all over the world and stamp political happiness or misery on ages yet unborn."⁹

As closing remark let me quote from one of his addresses to Congress in which he asked the Lord: "... to perpetuate to our country that prosperity which his goodness has already conferred and to verify the anticipations that this government be a safeguard to human rights."¹⁰

Footnotes at end of article.

As the cause of human rights was foremost in the mind of our first president so it appears to be a leading principle of our new president too. In his recent, quite sensational letter to Sakharov, the great Russian scientist and brave dissident, he emphasized that: "... we will continue our efforts to shape a world responsive to human aspirations in which nations of differing cultures and histories can live side by side in peace and justice."

One cannot fail to see that as centuries have passed, our first and present presidents still see their duty unchanged: to provide and protect equal liberty in peace with justice for all.

I'm sure much happiness and joy fills your heart when this country with these ever lasting principles officially accepts you as one of her citizens. As you start a new life among us I wish all of you good luck in all your endeavors.

God bless you—fellow citizens.

FOOTNOTES

Reference: The Writings of George Washington by Jared Parks Volume XII. Ferdinand Andrews Publisher. Boston, 1839.

¹ Page 120.

² Page 157.

³ Page 205.

⁴ Page 168.

⁵ Page 202.

⁶ Page 172.

⁷ Page 53.

⁸ Page 133.

⁹ Page 165.

¹⁰ Page 54.

SISTER STELLA MARIE CELEBRATES HER GOLDEN JUBILEE

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, I am often inspired and deeply moved with pride when I reflect on the great and humble personalities I have known in my lifetime. One such personality that stands at the forefront of my thoughts is Sister Stella Marie who will celebrate her golden jubilee as a religious nun on May 30, 1977. This golden jubilee celebration is but one of the many milestones in the 50 years Sister Stella Marie has been a servant of the Lord, an administrator, and an educator.

Sister Stella Marie Benben, is the daughter of the late Stanley and Josephine Siwek Benben. She was born on September 9, 1909, in Chicago, Ill. Her elementary education was received at Saints Peter and Paul and Nathanael Green Schools, and she graduated from Good Counsel High School.

August 15, 1927 marked the first landmark on a road that led Sister Marie to many years of gratifying service; she entered the Felician Community on that day. A year later, on August 12, 1928, she was invested in the habit of St. Francis. Then, with the passing of another year, she professed her first vows of chastity, obedience, and poverty. Her perpetual vows were taken 6 years later.

Later, Sister Marie was given a teaching assignment at St. James School in Chicago marking yet another milestone.

Teaching became a passion with Sister Marie. She served the children as she serves the Lord: with total devotion. For 8 years she taught the intermediate grades at St. James School, and spent 1 year at Holy Rosary School in North Chicago, Ill.

In 1938 Sister Stella Marie took her devotion to De Paul University where she worked for 2 years as a day student. On August 1, 1940 she received her bachelor science of commerce degree.

She joined the faculty at St. Joseph High School in Chicago and opened the secretarial department teaching shorthand, typewriting, and religion. She taught there for 17 years. Even while teaching she continued her personal education, working toward her master of arts degree in education which she received on June 13, 1951 from De Paul University.

Her hard work and devotion at St. Joseph led to the position of principal of Good Counsel High School. For 10 strong years she served as administrator there. She took on many ambitious projects which benefited the school. It was her supervision that guided the building of the new Good Counsel High School which she moved to in January 1966.

Later she returned to St. Joseph High School where she served as both a teacher in the business school and the assistant principal.

In 1971 and 1972 Sister Stella Marie served as the personnel manager at St. Mary's Home for the Aged in Manitowoc, Wis.

Sister Marie loved the people at the home but her heart was in the classroom. After 2 years she returned to St. Joseph High School where she is presently teaching shorthand, typewriting, and secretarial skills.

The celebration of her Golden Jubilee will be held on May 30, 1977 at the Motherhouse located at 3800 Peterson Avenue, Chicago, Ill., where a special Mass will be celebrated in her honor.

At the same Mass there will be many other nuns celebrating their Diamond, Golden, and Silver Jubilees. Those celebrating their Diamond Jubilee—75 years of service—will be Sister Mary Sanctuslaus Stempowski and Sister Mary Ambrose Manicki. Those celebrating their Golden Jubilees—50 years of service—will be:

Sister Mary Fidells Wyzkowski, Sister Mary Alacoque Wilczek, Sister Mary Lambert Rogala, Sister Mary Miriam Kontny, Sister Mary Ferreria Wardzala, Sister Mary Albinetta Tamillo, Sister Mary Dulceda Wirtel, Sister Mary Jeanne D'Arc Szczawinski, Sister Mary Viterbia Chmielewski, Sister Mary Cypriana Pawlikowski, and Sister Mary Lucretia Stopka.

Sister Mary Pontiana Kuspa, Sister Mary Theonille Veteska, Sister Mary Ewald Lupa, Sister Mary De Paul Sykta, Sister Stella Marie Benben, Sister Mary Redempta Lazarski, Sister Mary Nativitas Wlodarczyk, Sister Louise Marie Goralski, Sister Mary Geraldine Stopka, and Sister Mary Virgilia Raclawski.

Silver Jubilarians—25 years of Service—will be Sister Mary Franceline Gorski, Sister Mary Virginia Sztorc, and Sister Mary Marcelitta Krygowski.

These women are a great source of

pride. Their lives have served to inspire many, just as the life of Sister Stella Marie has inspired me to reflect, with such esteemed pride and honor, here before the House of Representatives.

THE U.S. DEFENSE EFFORT REQUIRES CRUISE MISSILE DEVELOPMENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Robinson of Aviation Week & Space Technology, recently wrote a most important article on the cruise missile and its relationship to the ongoing SALT II negotiations.

Mr. Robinson discussed the vital nature of this program to our defense effort and the threat to the future of our cruise missile technology posed by shortsighted negotiations.

We should take note of the fact that a moratorium on cruise missile development, as Mr. Robinson reminds us, would be one sided indeed, as the Soviets already have deployed cruise missiles with nuclear warheads that can be targeted against major U.S. population centers.

The article follows:

CRUISE MISSILE HALT CONSIDERED

(SALT negotiators base talks on development moratorium in exchange for backfire restrictions, delivery vehicle cuts.)

(By Clarence A. Robinson, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. is considering a moratorium on cruise missile development in order to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union for a second strategic arms limitation treaty.

U.S. and Soviet strategic arms negotiators meeting last week in Geneva based their discussions on the proposed moratorium for cruise missile development for an interim period in exchange for possible restrictions by the Soviet Union on its Tupolev Backfire bomber and some reductions in the total number of strategic delivery vehicles.

The cruise missile moratorium would be for the period between a second strategic arms treaty and a more comprehensive agreement reducing nuclear weapons called SALT-3.

Still unclear is the effect such an accommodation by the U.S. will have on hundreds of cruise missiles already deployed at sea by the USSR on surface vessels and submarines, and on a U.S. program designed to develop tactical anti-ship cruise missiles.

Verification of cruise missile limitations will be a sticky point in any agreement, according to U.S. officials, and even an on-site inspection, which the Soviets have rejected in the past, will not be foolproof because cruise missiles on both sides have been designed to carry both conventional and nuclear warheads.

Range limitations also are being considered by the U.S. and USSR negotiators to insure that cruise missiles are limited to tactical applications, but many cruise missiles already in the Soviet inventory, which are now guidance-limited, have aerodynamic capabilities far in excess of present guidance restrictions.

President Jimmy Carter is eyeing range restrictions for cruise missiles, which would permit deployment of only the air-launched

cruise missile (ALCM-A) with a range of under 1,000 naut. mi., according to some Administration officials. This would preclude the U.S. from completing development of the longer-range ALCM-B, the ground-launched Tomahawk or sea-launched strategic cruise missiles with ranges of about 2,000 naut. mi.

U.S. Negotiators also are preparing to begin talks in Washington next month aimed at reaching an agreement with the Soviets for a complete test ban treaty barring all nuclear weapons testing by both nations.

Like a cruise missile moratorium, such an agreement calling for a complete test ban places the U.S. in a disadvantaged position as opposed to the Soviet Union, U.S. officials said. The reason is that U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories need to complete some testing of nuclear weapons devices for the advanced mobile MX ICBM, the Trident D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missile and other weapons.

Such an agreement would halt all nuclear weapons testing in the U.S., but the Soviet Union could continue to test nuclear devices below a level of about 20 kilotons without detection by the U.S.

"Testing of such low yields may not seem important to those not knowledgeable in nuclear weapons development," a U.S. official said, "but it has permitted this country to make necessary fixes to warheads in the inventory over a period of years. The U.S. would certainly honor any such treaty, but the Russians might not, and we would not know about it until too late."

The U.S. cruise missile development programs and the Soviet Backfire bomber have been the focal point for disagreement between the two nations since the Ford-Brezhnev Vladivostok meeting when both sides agreed in principle to a limit of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles and a limit of 1,300 multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles. President Carter wants a SALT-2 pact, but is pressing for reductions below the Vladivostok level.

While the U.S. might not be able to deploy cruise missiles under any treaty providing for a moratorium, the Soviets already have deployed cruise missiles with nuclear warheads that can be targeted against major U.S. population centers. Soviet Echo 2 submarines armed with cruise missiles can lay off New York City at the 100-fathom line, which is about 95 mi. from the coast, and launch cruise missiles. The 100-fathom mark is about 125 mi. from Washington, D.C.

The ranges of Soviet SS-N-3 and an advanced SS-N-12 Shaddock-type cruise missile are guidance-limited to about 250 naut. mi., but their aerodynamic range is about 500 naut. mi. The missiles have provisions for a 2,200-lb. nuclear or conventional warhead, and missiles in the inventory are armed with both. Since the 1960s, the USSR has produced more than 5,000 cruise missiles in a variety of ranges. Cruise missile ranges generally fall into three categories:

Up to approximately 25 naut. mi., where the cruise missile can be guided to its target by radar, electro-optical and infrared sensors on the launch platforms. The U.S. Navy's Standard Arm missile on some small patrol boats and the USSR's SS-N-2 and SS-N-11 carried by Osa-class boats and some destroyers are in this category, as are submarine-launched SS-N-7 Sirens and the anti-submarine SS-N-14 missile.

Up to about 100 naut. mi. for use against targets over the horizon, where targeting is performed by helicopter or fixed-wing aircraft. The U.S. McDonnell Douglas Harpoon missile and the Soviet SS-N-9 missile are in this range category.

More than 100 naut. mi., with either fixed-wing aircraft or satellites used for targeting by the USSR. The U.S. Navy/General Dy-

namics Tomahawk cruise missile and the USAF/Boeing air-launched cruise missile would fall into this category along with the USSR SS-N-3 and its successor the SS-N-12, which is now deployed on the Soviet carrier Kiev. The U.S. cruise missiles use terrain contour matching guidance and are extremely accurate.

The SS-N-3 and SS-N-12 are deployed with a guidance relay system for use against moving targets such as ships at ranges to 250 naut. mi. This range limit now is determined by data link limitations. The missiles fly at altitudes of 10,000 to 20,000 ft., and the data link is used to correct drift errors in the early stages of flight.

The air-launched cruise missile is the only U.S. strategic cruise missile program now in development. The Tomahawk cruise missile, which could have a range of more than 2,000 naut. mi. with extreme accuracy, is now funded in development as a shorter-range anti-ship tactical weapon and theater nuclear weapon even though its potential as a strategic delivery vehicle is greater than the air-launched missile.

One of the major reasons the Soviets have been so adamant about halting the U.S. cruise missile program is the concern that the cruise missile will be deployed on the West German plains with nuclear warheads to replace U.S. aircraft now standing alert in Europe.

With the range capability of the Tomahawk, which would be the missile airframe for the ground-launched cruise missile, the weapon would reach areas of the Soviet land mass as well as defend against massed armor attacks thrown at North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations.

One of the major reasons the U.S. is moving toward placing cruise missiles in its inventory is the recent decline in the number of large aircraft carriers now providing principal striking power in conventional and tactical nuclear weapons for the Navy. The accuracy available in the weapon and the low altitudes at which it flies below radar detection make it an attractive weapon system, particularly in view of the thousands of surface-to-air missiles deployed in the Soviet Union. None of the U.S. cruise missiles now deployed matches the average weight of Soviet cruise missiles, and neither the Standard Arm nor the Harpoon has a nuclear warhead capability. All of the Soviet cruise missiles are believed to have a nuclear warhead option except the SS-N-2 and its successor, the SS-N-11.

Before the initial deployment of the Harpoon in 1976, only four small patrol craft operating in the Mediterranean were armed with the Standard Arm missile. The Harpoon is scheduled for deployment this summer on a large number of surface vessels, submarines and aircraft.

The USSR now has about 230 vessels at sea armed with cruise missiles. This includes surface ships in the aircraft carrier/missile cruiser configuration like the Kiev and several classes of cruisers and destroyers, as well as several classes of nuclear-propelled submarines.

The Defense Dept. was being asked last week by U.S. negotiators in Geneva to assess the effect of a moratorium on cruise missiles and to determine range limitations that could still permit development and deployment of tactical anti-ship cruise missiles.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff were scheduled for a White House meeting late last week to discuss the cruise missile issue and what the ramifications of a moratorium or range limitations would be on the weapons system.

In the June meeting in Washington on a complete test ban treaty, the U.S. is preparing to respond to a Soviet initiative offered earlier at Geneva for a complete test ban for a period of 18 to 24 months. The USSR wants to have other nations with nu-

clear weapons join in accepting a complete test ban agreement, particularly China. The interim period proposed is to see if other nations will agree to the ban along with the U.S. and the USSR.

EDITORIAL SCORES CONGRESS FOR NEGLECT OF MASS TRANSIT

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed that President Carter's April 20 energy message failed to propose vitally needed legislation to improve our deteriorating public mass transit systems. Recently, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams offered a proposal to use part of the standby gasoline tax for the purpose of revitalizing our transportation network. While I do not endorse the specifics of this proposal, which has not been approved by the administration, I feel that it is certainly a step in the right direction toward meeting the vital transportation needs of this Nation.

An editorial of the Philadelphia Inquirer appeared yesterday which underscored the need for more sensitivity toward our transportation needs, in view of our goals to reduce energy consumption. I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues:

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO END TRANSIT NEGLECT

U.S. Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams, testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, has suggested that gasoline tax revenues in the Carter energy program be earmarked for mass transit purposes.

That is a significant breakthrough—an encouraging indication of increased concern with transit needs by the Carter Administration. Such concern was absent conspicuously in the President's initial energy proposals.

The Adams suggestion merely scratches the surface, however. The time has come for America, now more urban than rural, to make a commitment to energy-efficient mass transit comparable to the commitment that was made to highways.

The Highway Trust Fund, fed by the gasoline tax and other vehicle-related revenues, has poured billions annually into highway construction for decades. Mass transit, a neglected orphan, wasted away in the process.

One place it wasted away was in the nation's capital. Despite belated efforts to catch up on transit needs with construction of a subway system, Washington public transportation has serious service and financial difficulties. Rush-hour bus fares will rise from 40 to 50 cents in July.

Secretary Adams, in another indication of growing Carter Administration concern about transit, has made a provisional offer of federal aid to help resolve the fiscal crisis in Washington's public transportation system.

On the same day that Secretary Adams testified before the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman James McConnon of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority also was on Capitol Hill. Testifying before the Surface Transportation Sub-

committee of the House, he made a strong case for comprehensive congressional action on mass transit this year.

More specifically, he called for increased federal aid for mass transit through establishment of a predictable funding base so that transit systems can meet immediate and long-range responsibilities in a nation confronted with limited energy resources.

An affirmative response to urban transit problems is required by Congress not only in the Philadelphia area, where SEPTA's financial troubles are of crisis proportions, but in cities and suburbs large and small throughout the country.

The Highway Trust Fund, as Mr. McConnon testified, "is grossly inequitable and unfair against the citizens in our metropolitan and urban areas" where mass transit systems are essential.

Mass transit, including rail lines, is in essence an urban extension of the highway system and should be funded with the recognition that, just as rural areas can't get along without highways, cities and suburbs can't get along without mass transit.

Highways and mass transit are not really competitive. They are complementary. Urban and rural members of Congress, working together, should produce a mutually acceptable program whereby substantial proceeds from gasoline tax revenues will be earmarked for mass transit commensurate with need.

Existing transit funds should be distributed equitably. Present formulas favor less densely populated areas at the expense of more densely populated areas. Chairman McConnon noted, for example, that the six-cents-per-passenger federal subsidy received by SEPTA compares with as high as 20 cents per passenger in some cities. Federal funds to SEPTA amounting to 20 percent of the operating deficit compare with subsidies as high as 50 percent elsewhere.

Commuter railroad services, a particularly attractive form of mass transit in terms of both travel time and energy conservation, urgently need stronger federal financial support. Existing federal law phases out U.S. contributions to cover commuter rail operating deficits. Congress should amend the law to preserve U.S. operating subsidies for commuter railroad lines.

State, regional and local governments also have heavy responsibilities to maintain and improve mass transit. But, it is the duty of Congress to recognize that prolonged federal neglect of mass transit, while highways were king, is the primary cause of the pitiful state of urban public transportation in the United States today. That neglect should be ended by Congress this year.

HOW REMOTE THE RISK OF SACCHARIN

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are greatly concerned that the FDA is about to move to ban saccharin from diet foods and drinks and even as a necessary sweetener for toothpaste orally administered medicines. They are becoming more concerned that Congress has done nothing to stop the ban. They do not regard the FDA claim as indicating much of a risk.

Only about a fourth of the population uses saccharin, but a recent survey

showed that the public opposes the ban 5-to-1. Since the risk is remote at worst, most people reject the need for a ban, feeling that it would suffice to require warning labels and educate the public as to the risk.

What is the risk?

That can only be answered by making a series of assumptions based on the 1977 Canadian research. The FDA has estimated there would be 0-to-1,200 additional cases, only a 4-percent increase over the current 30,000 cases a year. That upper range is based on inflated arithmetic, and is probably high by a factor of 40.

First, you must assume that humans are as sensitive at their low dose as the rates are at the experimentally necessary, but nevertheless outrageously large, overdose. You must assume that the carcinogenic effect observed in the rats is chemically induced rather than the result of extreme physical irritation—otherwise there would be a no-effect threshold just a little lower than the massive overdose. If you allow these doubtful assumptions, for the sake of calculation, then you can assume that the dose/response curve is a straight line: that the frequency of cancer is proportional to the saccharin consumed.

Any average daily dose can then be used for the calculation, because whether you figure 1 million consumers taking two cans of diet drink or 2 million consuming one can per day, the predicted tumor incidence will be the same. This calculation will use a 150 mg/day dosage, because that is about the saccharin content of a single 12½-ounce diet beverage, and because that is the dose assumed in the FDA calculation. For a 60 kilogram—132 pound—human, 150 mg represents a saccharin diet of 2.5 mg per kg of body weight; which is one-thousandth the rat dosage of 2,500 mg/kg.

It is pointless to assume next that every man, woman and child in America consumes 150 mg of saccharin a day. That would total 26 million pounds of the stuff a year, when in actual fact: Only 6 million pounds of saccharin is actually consumed in this country. So, there's only enough for 50 million Americans to get an average of 150 mg per day.

First, 216 million Americans times 150 milligrams per day over 454 grams per pound times 365 days per year over 1,000 milligrams per gram equals 26 million pounds.

Second, 6 million pounds per year over 365 days per year times 454 milligrams per pound over 150 milligrams per day per person equals 49.7 million persons.

While some argue that women consume more saccharin than men, it does not affect the next step much to assume the simplest case, that the 50 million Americans consist of 25 million each of men and women. This could of course be refined further, as could the 60 kilogram body weight average, and would only result in a slightly smaller calculated risk.

Now, if 25 million males ingest 2.5 mg/kg of saccharin per day their risk—as a first approximation—would be 0.1

percent of the fraction of the male test animals found to develop bladder tumors at 2,500 mg/kg dosage. Since 24 percent of the test rats developed tumors, the chance for 25 million human males would be: $25,000,000 \times 0.24 \times 0.001 = 6,000$ tumors over their lifetime.

Since the life expectancy of U.S. males is 71 years, there would be 85 cases a year ($6,000 \div 71$), unless modified by other assumptions.

In the 1977 Canadian research, female test rats had no significant increase in cancer. Rather than assume that females are immune, a better assumption would be that since human females experience only one-third the incidence of bladder tumors as males: their sensitivity would be one-third that of males. Accordingly, with a life expectancy of 73 years, the risk—first approximation—for 25 million females would be $25,000,000 \times 0.24 \times 0.001 \times 0.33 = 27$ tumors.

The combined total would be $85 + 27 = 112$ tumors per year—not 1,200—as an upper limit, provided no other assumptions are required. Another inescapable assumption is, however, required.

There is no experimentally significant increase in cancer in test rats unless both of two drastic conditions are imposed:

First. They must be fed at least 2,500 mg/kg/day; and

Second. This high dosage must begin with the mother at conception, continuing throughout the pregnancy, so that the fetus is exposed in utero to a very high concentration effect within the placenta.

If both conditions are met, there is a significant increase in bladder tumors; if not, there is no significant result. If, as already assumed, there are 50 million saccharin users—23 percent of the population—then 23 percent of mothers might be expected to use saccharin during pregnancy. Thus, only 23 percent of the lifetime users would also meet the second test of being exposed in utero. That reduces the upper risk to 23 percent of 112, or 26 tumors.

Once again, it must be emphasized that this is an upper limit of a range of 0-to-26. If you assume, as I do, that the carcinogenic effect in the rat is only due to an unrelenting physical torture of the bladder tissues by the microcrystals formed at such high doses, then it is highly unlikely that lower doses would cause any tumors at all.

Two further observations should be made. Since one-third of bladder tumors are benign, the upper limit of malignant cancers may be even smaller ($26 \times .67 = 17$).

Since 30 percent of bladder tumors are fatal, the mortality rate predicted by the upper limit of this calculation would be: $(26 \times 0.30) = 8$. These numbers are regrettable if there is in fact even one such death, but are small indeed when compared with the current American rate of 30,000 bladder tumors a year and a bladder cancer mortality rate of 9,000 a year. Thus, less than 0.1-percent increase is predicted.

No one is in favor of even one addi-

tional cancer, just as we are not in favor of one additional highway fatality or heart attack. Nevertheless, it is important to correct the earlier faulty estimate that the risk is in the range of 0-to-1,200 cases a year, because that upper number is being quoted as though: first, it were a reasonable calculation; and second, there were actually some evidence to back it up.

In fact, there is no evidence that any human has ever gotten one tumor from the normal consumption of saccharin.

Even if all the assumptions are granted and the upper limit of 8 additional deaths is assumed, it would make no more sense to ban saccharin over this, than it would to ban leafy vegetables, grains, nuts, processed meats, milk, eggs, and butter; or reduce the automobile speed limit from 55 mph to 54.9 mph.

ASSESSMENT ON CIVIL DEFENSE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, civil defense as a part of our national security program has been too long ignored, while the Soviet Union has for years been extremely active in this critical area.

Col. John Bex has been one of our most outstanding directors in our civil defense effort. An acknowledged expert in the field, Colonel Bex has written an assessment of our current state of civil defense, and I commend most highly his thoughts to my colleagues:

NATION LACKS BASIC POLICY, DIRECTION (By Col. John E. Bex, USAFR)

(The purpose of this article is to provide an assessment of the mismanagement and neglect which has existed in the federal government in preparing the United States citizenry for survival and recovery under national and local emergency conditions and to propose a different direction. The author is Director, Region II, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, Department of Defense.)

We are lacking a basic national Civil Defense policy and direction which would provide for survival of the nation and which would serve to guide the efforts of all federal agencies involved and provide a model for state and local governments to follow.

The House Armed Services Committee Report No. 84-39 states that, "It is apparent . . . that civil defense, or emergency preparedness in a broader concept, has no settled place in the federal government." The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, authorizes a system of civil defense for the protection of life and property from an attack. To administer this act there has been a succession of agencies—FCDA, OCD, OCDD, OCD and now DCPA—which have been established to taken certain actions in preparation for an attack situation.

The National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and related Executive Orders cause the General Services Administration, Federal Preparedness Agency (GSA/FPA), to be responsible for Federal Agency

coordination, policy guidance and planning related to attack and recovery.

The Disaster Relief Act of 1974 and related Executive Orders cause the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration (FDAA) to be responsible for administering and coordinating certain planning and relief programs related to natural disaster situations.

39 UNITS INVOLVED

In all there are 11 federal departments and 28 or more federal agencies that have emergency preparedness assignments involving national preparedness and our ability to survive.

Not since 25 May 1961, when President Kennedy delivered his civil defense message to Congress, has a Chief Executive publicly addressed the need for civil defense. Civil Defense is a part of our total strategic deterrent posture. It is a primary element for national survival. But the need for survival planning and its acceptance as an essential way of life in the nuclear age have not been articulated convincingly to the public from the executive level.

EFFECTS

Lack of national purpose and direction has resulted in little more than a holding action on United States civil defense. The defense part of the offense/defense equation has been continuously de-emphasized. The Civil Defense part of the defense posture has suffered out of proportion to all other elements. Of the 114.9 billion dollars projected for FY National Defense Budget, only \$82.5 million (.07%) of the National Defense Budget was set aside for Civil Defense.

The lack of national priority, unified management and supervisory controls has resulted in duplication of effort, disparity in actions, waste of money, and inefficient accomplishment of the nation's emergency needs. Confusion due to the splintered federal effort is reflected at state and local government levels. These jurisdictions find it extremely difficult to ascertain which federal agencies are doing what and for whom.

In recent hearings on Civil Preparedness and Limited Nuclear War, before the Joint Committee on Defense Preparedness, Gen. Otto Nilson, Jr. (Ret.) stated that "... numerous Governmental agencies . . . have . . . an emergency or crises role as an extension of their everyday duties and responsibilities. What is needed is for this to be spelled out and organizational means developed to assure that this is done, that the work is monitored to assess performance, and that the pieces are put together on the basis of some workable coordination effort."

LACK OF RESOLUTION

Apathy at state and local levels reflects the lack of federal resolution and purpose of a national scale. The defense of the country and the protection of the people are elements of the common defense as provided for under the Constitution and are primarily a federal responsibility. The general public reacts to a national situation in the way in which their leaders react. Apathy and indifference at the federal level cascades and permeates all political levels making the prospect of providing adequately for the common defense an insurmountable task.

Cuts in the federal budget for Civil Defense are echoed in the budgets of state and local governments. The result is widespread atrophy. For example, there is erosion in the National Shelter System, Radiological Defense System and Emergency Public Information System. At the same time, we are only able to effectively warn about 47 percent of the national population and have a "minimum" nuclear disaster operational capability for about 36 percent of the national population.

Avoidance of the issues by recent Chief Executives has left the public confused, uncer-

tain, fatalistic and virtually uninformed as to the value of Civil Defense as an instrument of national survival. The result is a weakness in our national will to sustain crises, and survive attack, inviting coercion or blackmail in our strategic posture. Former Secretary of State Kissinger said that "a thermonuclear war which broke over a psychologically unprepared population might lead to a loss of faith in society and government."

PLAN FOR ACTION

The Congress and Chief Executive should undertake coordinate action to establish and promulgate a policy of emergency preparedness and survival. This policy should cover the complete spectrum of emergency preparedness from local natural and accidental disaster to that of a nuclear attack upon the country, since there is large element of commonality in the systems and services which are involved in such situations.

Emergency preparedness functions and services presently under the three agencies (DCPA, GSA/FPA and FDAA) should be combined into a single agency to provide for management control and operational efficiency. This agency should be placed in the Department of Defense (at the Secretary or Service level) so that a balanced effort between offensive and defensive priorities can be achieved. Primary responsibilities would be vested in the Department of Defense with other federal departments and agencies providing directed support.

In order for civil preparedness to be successful, the Secretary of the new agency must be a strong leader who is dedicated and firmly committed to the survival mission. He must have the confidence of the President and Secretary of Defense, must be experienced in effecting rapport with the congressional, state and local leadership. He must be unencumbered in his personal commitment to a viable civil preparedness and readiness posture. This position requires a creative manager dedicated to change.

Adequate funding support is required for civil preparedness and national emergency support functions to assure a viable program which can develop into a significant element of national strategic defense and provide civilian protection from the effects of a national calamity.

While we cannot keep the American populace continuously mobilized for war, we must keep the people informed and do a better job of educating them to the kind of austerity and commitment that they would be called to undertake in a nuclear emergency.

TO THE CLASS OF 1977: NOT EVERYTHING IS WRONG WITH OUR COUNTRY—BY ROBERT M. BLEIBERG

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1973, then Ambassador to India, DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, authored an essay for Saturday Review, entitled "A Country in Need of Praise." It stands today as one of the most thoughtfully and convincingly articulated writings in praise of the American people's accomplishments to be published.

But the greatest impact of that article was in his description of what unbridled, "irresistibly chic" criticism of America, its institutions, its achievements, and of what falsely characterizing segments of its people can do to the national mood.

In short, he showed how such self-flagellation undercuts the social energies needed to set right those things which are wrong, how it can become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Let me quote briefly from this essay:

In 1970, toward the end of his life, so unhappily cut short, Richard Hofstadter described the 1960s as "The Age of Rubbish." A man of the Democratic Left, he was depressed by the rise of a vulgar—but "irresistibly chic"—radicalism among the well educated and well to do. He found "almost the entire intellectual community . . . lost in dissent." There was almost no dialogue left "between those who are alienated from society and those who are prepared to make an intelligent defense of it."

A generation ago the great social critic Joseph Schumpeter described the mind-set of a type of intellectual, endemic to bourgeois democracy, who avoids having to acknowledge any evidence that the society has successfully undertaken and achieved certain objectives by dismissing the objectives as trivial: "A sneer will serve as well as a refutation. . . ." It sometimes seems we have gone beyond this to the point where evidence is not so much trivialized as politicized. Facts become a kind of code in which, seeming innocuous to the uninformed, they reveal sinister realities to the initiated.

Now, the apocalyptic style of recent politics has been costly. It wears out its welcome. Already one can sense the nation turning away from important matters that it was patiently, and on the whole successfully, working at. If nothing is ever achieved, what, then, is the point of trying?

This is the danger of dwelling only, or mainly, on the nation's troubles. And how much the nation deserves praise, and how much it needs it! To recognize and acknowledge success, however modest, is fundamental to the practice of government. It is a first principle of leadership in a democracy, where loyalty must be directed more to institutions than to individuals. Robert C. Tucker notes that charismatic leadership derives in considerable measure from the ability to "accentuate the sense of being in a desperate predicament." This is rarely a climate in which liberties flourish. It perhaps accounts for the unease with which many view the relentless emphasis on social failure and corruption that characterizes the New Politics. It too readily follows that a system that could tolerate so much wrong must itself be wrong. In any event, it is no way to summon the social energies that are needed to set things right.

Mr. Speaker, I had not since seen any other presentation which made the point as cogently, as convincingly, until I read in the current issue of Barron's excerpts from the commencement address of its editor, Robert M. Bleiberg, at the 125th commencement exercises of Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich., this month.

Bob Bleiberg observes how the constant chiding from some quarters in our country of the market economy, the free enterprise system, business and commerce in general has done exactly what PAT MOYNIHAN predicted. It has obscured the inalienable link between political and economic freedom. It has diverted the attention of society on from how to replicate the many successes to how to ameliorate the relatively small number of failures. It has drawn managers and workers alike from their principal tasks—making more and better mousetraps at less cost to the consumer. In short, no matter how well intentioned, government intrusion in and interfer-

ence with the economy has hurt more than it has helped.

I commend Bob Bleiberg for this address. He is an astute observer of the economy and of the social and political milieu in which it tries to function.

This is well worth the careful reading of every Member of Congress. It follows:

TO THE CLASS OF 1977 NOT EVERYTHING IS WRONG WITH OUR COUNTRY

(By Robert M. Bleiberg)

Herewith some thoughts (random and otherwise) suitable for use on Commencement Day. And now, Class of '77, let's get down to business. You're about, as the saying goes, to go out into the world, and, by most contemporary accounts, an ugly world it is. So many shortcomings and failings—high unemployment, rampant pornography, widespread pollution, corruption in high places, notably the executive suite. Illegal political contributions, corporate payoffs, foreign bribes by hundreds of major U.S. corporations. Watergate gone, but not forgotten. From Wall Street to Washington, nearly everyone, it sometimes seems, is a crook.

That's what sells newspapers, and, as far as it goes, it's true enough. But let's try to put the facts in perspective. Some four hundred companies have owned up to impropriety or worse. Thousands of others have been found guilty of nothing. To illustrate, the ranks of publicly owned companies include 1,145 listed on the American Stock Exchange, 1,553 listed on the New York Stock Exchange, and roughly 11,000 traded over-the-counter, or nearly 14,000 publicly owned concerns in all. Last time I looked, the 400-odd culprits constituted barely 3% of the publicly owned total.

All told, there also happen to be more than two million U.S. corporations, public and private alike, as well as more than one million partnerships and roughly 11 million individual proprietorships. Fourteen million units do business in this country. How many, and what percentage, of them have been publicly involved in shady dealings? What percentage of the tens of millions of U.S. businessmen, or the trillion-plus dollars worth of goods and services which they help to produce have been tainted by impropriety or illegality?

Nor can we afford to forget that allegedly improper corporate conduct may cover a multitude of sins. On this score, eloquent testimony has come from Albert Sommer Jr., former SEC Commissioner. Last spring, Mr. Sommer told the Ohio Legal Institute that owing to the absence of clear-cut standards of disclosure, "Many companies have simply chosen to disclose every payment, no matter how trifling, that might in any way be questioned. Thus we have learned that huge multinational corporations made political and other questionable contributions in amounts as little as \$100; in many instances, disclosure has been made of small payments which were clearly legal under the laws of the country where made, and in other instances were at worst of questionable legality. All of this reminds me of the sorry spectacle in Soviet Russia in the 1930s, when erring bureaucrats almost literally fell over each other confessing various 'crimes' against the state."

So much for crime in the suites. To the corporate coin, there is another more glittering—if far less publicized—side. While the number of jobless (a figure, by the way, which greatly overstates the case, since it includes a good many workers who have just quit their jobs) does stand at 7% of the labor force, more Americans today are gainfully employed than ever before in U.S. history. Indeed, in January-March of this year, the private sector created over one million jobs

(and, in the past 12 months, more than 2.6 million).

By the same token, thanks to American industry, marvels of technology—citizens band radios, hand calculators, home computers, with all their built-in potentialities for enlarging our capacities and enriching our lives—flow in an endless stream from drawing-board to assembly line. The much-maligned Lockheed Corp. deploys the Hercules Airlifter, which, when famine, flood or earthquake strikes, gets there fastest with the mostest by way of disaster relief. And despite the many obstacles raised by the Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry continues to make significant additions to the nation's medicine chest.

On this score, despite the environmentalist hue and cry over chemical additives, pesticides and pollution, the people of this country over the decades have enjoyed an uninterrupted growth in longevity. For example, since World War II—here's a statistic you're not apt to read in the daily press or hear over the major television networks—life expectancy in the U.S. has increased from 65.9 years to 72.5 years. In the past decade alone, it's risen by two-plus years.

Many other things are right with the country, including a steady growth in benevolence. According to that benevolent institution known as the Internal Revenue Service, over the past 10 years charitable contributions by taxpayers have increased from \$9.1 billion to \$15.4 billion; tax-deductible or not, that's a lot of good works. And even today, despite the proliferation of federal regulation, the number of new businesses incorporated year-by-year shows a steady rise. Finally, for young people like yourselves, here's a noteworthy statistic: in 1977, for only the sixth time in the 32 years since World War II, compulsory military service, with all its ugly statist overtones, is no longer part of the domestic scene.

Contrast the glittering record of private enterprise with that of the public sector, a comparison which, unfortunately, too few of our fellow citizens ever seem to make. Indeed, with respect to the relative performance of government and industry, a curious and ugly double standard has long come into play. For government can commit the most egregious blunders—if they aren't recorded for posterity on tape, or somehow leaked to Jack Anderson—with apparent impunity. After 30 years and the outlay of hundreds of billions of dollars, the powers-that-be confess that the welfare state has become an unworkable mess and blandly seek new, and doubtless costlier, federal solutions. After more than a generation of something for nothing, the Social Security system piles up over \$4 trillion in unfunded liabilities, and, as even its most fervent proponents have just been forced to concede, is well on the way toward going broke.

Some of the specific facts and figures cited above may be news to you. However, thanks in large measure to your college years, the views which I have tried to express—an abiding confidence in private initiative, deep suspicion of government—are now a basic part of your intellectual equipment. And thanks to your distinguished teachers, you've learned perhaps the most important lesson of all, namely, that one man on the side of right is an army.

Nor need one be an educator, journalist or other kind of professional to fight the good fight. On this score, there are a couple of businessmen about whom you ought to know more (and whom I learned about from my colleague, Jim Grant). One sells groceries in Bessemer, Ala., the other sells sportswear in San Jose, Calif. Each owns his own business, and each, when threatened by coercive government action, stood his ground and fought back. Mel Solomon, the California retailer,

mailed out a 25,000-piece promotion for a Fourth of July sale two years ago. The Post Office (which, by law, he had to patronize) promptly lost 10,000 of his flyers. The sale was a flop and Solomon, out of pocket some \$20,000 brought suit. It's still in progress.

Meanwhile, in Bessemer, Ala., the owner of a food store, Sam Pilitteri by name, reached the conclusion that the State Milk Commission had no right to tell him what prices to charge. He proceeded to cut prices, in defiance of the law, but to the benefit of his customers' pocketbooks and to his own ultimate profit. Served with an injunction, he counter-sued, demanding that the Commission be declared unconstitutional. As the trial began, the latter abolished its own pricing decree, but Pilitteri wasn't satisfied. The trial went forward.

The result? Two months ago, the Alabama State Circuit Court ruled in Pilitteri's favor. Cost studies used by the state, so the Court held, "have resulted in subsidizing the inefficient producer, processor, distributor and retailer at the expense of the more efficient producer, processor, distributor and retailer, as well as subsidizing such inefficiency at the expense of the consuming public. Ordered, adjudged and decreed, that the actions of the plaintiff in fixing, establishing, administering and enforcing the price or prices of fluid milk be and said actions are hereby declared to be null and void."

Some may say that freedom is a lost cause, and, despite the moral imperative of Commencement, which virtually compel one to look on the bright side, in all candor there's plenty of cause for concern. Compared to the alternatives, however, this is one cause, lost or otherwise, for which everyone here should be ready, willing and able to take up the cudgels.

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY J. HATOFF

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarkable accomplishments of one of Boston's most outstanding community leaders, Stanley J. Hatoff. Stan is general chairman of the Greater Boston Israel Bond Campaign and vice president of Temple Mishkan Tefila, and in that position, he has been awarded the Shield of Honor Award.

The bond campaign leaders, in discussing the significance of the award, noted that Stan Hatoff is a "man who has never said no to a friend or any noteworthy endeavor. He is a dynamic and articulate leader whose notable triumphs in spearheading civic and communal projects for so many of our key community agencies and institutions has resulted in new levels of accomplishment. His leadership in behalf of Israel Bonds has enrolled many new supporters and raised the level of support for Israel."

Stan Hatoff came up through the ranks of the Boston Israel Bond Organization, serving as cash mobilization chairman, congregations chairman and as executive vice chairman of the campaign cabinet.

Despite his manifold duties as head of the Israel Bond Campaign, Stan finds

time to provide needed leadership for numerous major local organizations and institutions. He is a fellow of Brandeis University; vice president and fundraising chairman of the Boston Brandeis Club; vice president of Associated Synagogues of Massachusetts; trustee of new England Sinai Hospital; a patron of the Jewish Theological Seminary, from which he received the National Community Service Award in 1974.

Stan is the kind of man whose commitment, dedication and integrity set him apart from the great majority of people. I would like to take this opportunity to join the Jewish community in Boston and throughout Massachusetts in honoring Stan Hatoff, and in honoring Stan Hatoff, and in congratulating him on receiving the Shield of Honor.

MEMORIAL DAY: A TIME TO REMEMBER THE DEAD AND HONOR THE LIVING

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Monday marks this Nation's observance of Memorial Day when we traditionally pay tribute to those men and women who gave of themselves so that we may be free today. Their sacrifices are the cornerstone upon which we have built this Nation's greatness.

In addition to paying tribute to those who died in the service of their country, Memorial Day should also be a day when we honor and rededicate ourselves in behalf of those men and women who are our living veterans and who so honorably served this Nation. In particular, I think it appropriate that we honor those veterans who served this country with honor during the difficult and controversial years of the Vietnam war. We must do so by providing them with educational and employment opportunities which will help restore to them their rightful and proper place in our society. The present structure of the Vietnam veterans' GI bill prohibits hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of our most needy and deserving veterans from obtaining the educational and vocational training to facilitate their readjustment. Our programs specifically designed to assist Vietnam veterans in gaining meaningful employment suffer from acute disorganization and lack of coordination.

We in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, are in the unique position of being able to right these wrongs and the legislation necessary to accomplish this end is pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2231, the Comprehensive Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1977, which has been cosponsored by over 70 of my colleagues, and H.R. 1370 specifically are designed to restore our Vietnam veterans with the educational opportunities they need. H.R. 6590, the Comprehensive Veterans Employment Training and Supportive

Services Act of 1977, would, by establishing coordination between the Department of Labor and employers, bring order out of the chaos of our present veterans employment programs. These bills, as well as many others now pending in committee, would help bring meaning back into the lives of our forgotten Vietnam veterans.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor our dead on this Memorial Day, let us also rededicate ourselves in behalf of those living veterans who can only look to us for a solution to their problems. In the memory of the dead let us honor the living.

FARM BILL A COMPROMISE

HON. JOSEPH S. AMMERMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. AMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon debate the Agricultural Act of 1977—H.R. 7171. I want to report to you on the committee action which shaped the bill and my views on it.

After lengthy hearings and drafting sessions which have occupied most of the year to date, the House Agriculture Committee, of which I am the only Pennsylvania member, at last has reported out a comprehensive farm bill.

Most of the major Federal agricultural legislation was up for renewal this year. Thus, the committee was confronted with the task of extending, or at the very least reexamining, a massive number of programs.

One of the major struggles during the committee's work on the bill was to keep the price supports for farmers—or more correctly, the crop target price and loan programs—at reasonable levels. President Carter's proposals called for very tight spending limits on price supports.

I can only report mixed results to you on this issue.

On a narrow 23 to 22 vote, Committee Chairman THOMAS S. FOLEY, Democrat of Washington, was able to beat back an effort to increase wheat target prices to a level far above that acceptable to President Carter. I voted with Representative FOLEY against that increase.

We also defeated a similar move on corn prices. Even so, the bill as reported by the committee provides price levels somewhat above those requested by the Carter administration, although substantially below those set in the Senate's farm bill.

Farmers in Pennsylvania for the most part expressed concern that higher feed grain prices would increase the cost of the dairy operations which are a key element of Pennsylvania agriculture.

I am not completely happy with the way the bill came out, but I do recognize that Chairman FOLEY had to strike a very delicate balance among the conflicting objectives of the grain belt farmers, eastern dairymen, and other important groups.

As far as the dairy price support program itself was concerned, most of the Pennsylvania farmers who contacted me

said they did not favor an increase in the statutory floor for such supports which currently is 75 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture can set higher support levels and Secretary Bergland recently increased them to 83 percent of parity.

We did not win this fight in committee, but we did hold the increase in the support floor at 80 percent of parity instead of the 85 percent some committee members sought.

For research, extension service, teaching and facilities, the bill authorizes \$950 million in fiscal year 1978 and will increase spending on these programs to \$1.4 billion by the 1982 fiscal year. These programs all have been authorized for 5 years while the price support programs are extended for 4.

The bill's provisions are so numerous that I really cannot list them all. Further, the measure provides spending authorizations for such programs as food stamps and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, which will be addressed in separate legislation.

As with anything so complex, the bill has its good points and its weak points. It will be helpful to Pennsylvania in many ways; less helpful in others. But I think the benefits were sufficient for me to vote for it in committee and to join Chairman FOLEY in cosponsoring the version being sent to the House floor.

ARMED FORCES WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week was "Armed Forces Week." At a time, when we are not faced with a major threat of war, we must recognize the necessity of maintaining a strong military defense force, second to none, in order to protect our national security interests and the peace and freedom in the world.

Members of our military services deserve our respect, appreciation, support and prayers. I insert a very fine editorial broadcast by Chicago's WGN Radio and TV, on May 16, in honor of this special observance.

[WGN Editorial No. 77-118, Monday, May 16, 1977]

"ARMED FORCES WEEK"

This week all across the nation, has been proclaimed "Armed Forces Week." In paying tribute to the men and women of our Armed Forces, let us not forget the importance of a "Total Force." This includes the thousands of civilians working in many areas of our Armed Services; also, the National Guardsmen and Reservists who have assumed an even greater role in our nation's defense, and are deeply involved in the total combat capability.

No longer do these Reserve Forces have to depend upon obsolete equipment handed down to them. They now receive the most modern and sophisticated weapons available. These are no longer just weekend warriors; they are now full-fledged partners with their active duty counterparts.

Spending for national defense takes one of

the larger chunks of our federal tax dollars. We have the right as taxpayers to insist that these dollars be spent as carefully as is consistent with maintaining our national defense. It is our opinion that the total force concept, the linking of regular forces and what we call the weekend warriors, is one way to assure that this is being done.

So, here is a verbal salute to those dedicated men and women, all of those who wear a uniform every day or only for drills and summer exercises . . . from all of us.

THE 1976-77 REPORT ON THE POLISH CULTURAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to report that the Polish Cultural Society of America, Inc., P.O. Box 31, Wall Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10005, is a loyal American service organization which endeavors to represent the best interests of 11,000,000 loyal and dedicated Americans of Polish heritage throughout the Nation. The national chairman of the Polish Cultural Society of America is Mr. Raymond H. Paluch, a distinguished businessman, patriot, and past commander of the New York State Veterans Association as well as an active member of many civic organizations engaged in philanthropic, eleemosynary, social amelioration and humanitarian endeavors.

The basic purpose of the Polish Cultural Society of America is "to undeviatingly support the Constitution of the United States of America and the institutions of freedom and democracy embodied in our American Bill of Rights as enunciated in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution." Membership in the Polish Cultural Society of America, Inc. and in its subdivisions is open without any restrictions or hindrance, whatsoever, to all loyal Americans irrespective of differences of race, color, creed, sex, or country of origin.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to submit for the Record, the 1976-77 Report on the Polish Cultural Society of America, Inc. The society is a national organization devoted to serving the interests and needs of 11 million members of the Polish-American community.

THE 1976-1977 REPORT ON THE POLISH CULTURAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.

THE POLISH CULTURAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC. MAKES A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS

In the past year, The Polish Anti-Defamation League placed itself in the forefront of the organizations fighting the infamous Arab boycott of American businesses because these companies trade with Israel or have American Jews who are owners or directors of these businesses. The Arab boycott of American business in this respect has been declared, by President Jimmy Carter, "as an absolute disgrace." In addition, The Polish Anti-Defamation League, a subsidiary of The Polish Cultural Society of America Inc., worked with its utmost effort not only in honoring the millions of Polish and Jewish victims of the

Nazi Holocaust, but in also attempting to secure the ratification of the Geneva International Convention Against Genocide by The United States Senate.

UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS DECLARATION OF THE POLISH ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

(1) The Polish Anti-Defamation League Is Dedicated To The Proposition That All Human and Civil Rights Are Universal, Defensible, and Sacred.

(2) The Polish Anti-Defamation League Believes That The Sacred Universal Rights Of All Human Beings Must Be Legally Defended and Protected At All Times.

(3) The Polish Anti-Defamation League Believes That All People of Good Will Must Join The Crusade For Enlightened Humanity! . . . The Polish Anti-Defamation League, In Traditional and Historic Reliance on The American Bill of Rights and The Constitution of the United States, and in Affirmation of the United Nations Covenant On Human Rights . . . Believes That Indifference and Apathy to Character Assassination, Villification, Derogation of Integrity, and Corrosive Defamation, Oral and Written, of Persons of Polish or of Any Origin, Constitutes a Farflung, Destructive, Pathological Social Degeneration Which Can Only Be Cured By the Direct and Dedicated Social Involvement of Enlightened Individuals and Corporations Who Will Not Only Defend and Fight For Their Own Precious and Unalienable Rights and Liberties, But Also For the Sacred Rights and Liberties Of Others.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT REQUIRED!

(4) Therefore, In This Era of Growing Technological and Telecommunications Expansion and Tension, The Polish Anti-Defamation League Has Instituted Appeals To All Citizens In All Walks of Life to Financially Support This "Crusade For Universal Equal Humanity" Supported By and Under The Fatherhood of GOD and The Brotherhood of Man.

NEW SUBDIVISIONS

Among the new subdivisions formed by The Polish Cultural Society, Inc. were the Polish Genealogy Society, The Polish-American Consumers Council, The Polish-American Senior Citizens League, The Copernicus CB Club, The Radio and Television Listeners of America and The Society of the Friendly Sons and Daughters of Copernicus, US Merit Awards Council and The Copernicus International Travel Club.

AWARDS AND HONORS

Among the distinguished world and public citizens who have received Awards "For Distinguished Public Service" from The Polish Cultural Society of America Inc. are: Artur Rubinstein, John Chancellor, Gerald R. Ford, Clarence M. Kelley, Edmund G. Brown, Percy Sutton, Shirley Chisholm, Jesse Zaslav, Abraham Beame, Norman Lent, John M. Murphy, Jacob K. Javits, Edward Koch, Jack R. Muratori, Daniel P. Moynihan, Jonathan Bingham, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Lester L. Wolff, Theodore Weiss, Harrison Williams, James J. Delaney, Herman Badillo, Jack F. Kemp, Henry Jackson, Edward H. Lehner, Gary Hart, John Mulhearn, Barry Farber, Bruce Morrow, Dick Summer, Steve Powers, Dan Meenan, Bob Grant, Evrard Williams, John W. Wylder and Howard Cannon.

A BRAVE BOY SCOUT

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, next month will mark the sixth anniversary of the

drowning of an Albuquerque, N. Mex., Boy Scout in the Green River in Utah. Peter McCarthy was well prepared for his trip and along with the other Scouts of Troop 442, he met his fate in an accident when his raft encountered rapids and fallen trees in the river.

The majority of the Scouts were able to reach the shore immediately. However, Peter and another Scout were swept downstream. Peter's friend had lost his lifejacket and Peter, in a heroic gesture, called out to him to hang on to his jacket in order to keep from falling deeper into the rapids.

The couple floated for approximately 3 or 4 hours when Peter appeared to be losing consciousness. The two tried to reach safety at the crown of a bank, but Peter, in weakened state, could not make the climb. His body was found downstream by another group of Scouts.

I would like to recognize Peter posthumously as a brave and fearless young man who reached out to save a friend's life only to lose his own. I would like to offer my prayers to Peter's family and close friends at this time and ask my colleagues to join with me.

THE DEBAUCHERY OF OUR CHILDREN

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the time is at hand for the people of our Nation to rebel against the nefarious "exploitation" of the children of America. It is deplorable that our youngsters are becoming victimized by the purveyors and practitioners of what psychoanalyst Rollo May calls the "new puritanism," the current philosophy which promotes "sex without love and sex deliberately separated from the unique human capacities of passion and commitment."

I am appalled by recent reports of children—some as young as 3 years old—being shown in pornographic films and magazines, posing for explicit sexual acts. It is my understanding that this segment of the booming, billion dollar pornography industry is perpetrated by a steady supply of runaway children who, as Time reports, serve as a "ready pool of 'acting talent' for photographers" for a meal or money, and who often become residents of houses of prostitution.

Little imagination is needed to realize the psychological effect of all this on the child-victims of the craze of perversion. New York psychoanalyst Herbert Freudenberger states that:

Children who pose for pictures begin to see themselves as objectives to be sold. They cut off their feelings of affection, finally responding like objects rather than people.

An even greater damage and danger to the community at large is that, in the opinion of Los Angeles psychiatrist Roland Sumit, sexually abused children may become sexually abusing adults. And so, the sinister cycle continues.

I feel real outrage over the absence of protective and punitive Federal legislation in the area of child pornography; but, I am encouraged by the recent legislative initiatives of my colleagues. Twenty-five percent of the Members of the House of Representatives have joined in the cosponsorship of effective child protection legislation—H.R. 4572, the "Child Abuse Protection Act". In the Senate, two similar bills have been introduced and cosponsored by at least 20 percent of that body.

A principal argument by the detractors of these legislative measures is that they pose first amendment problems akin to those created by obscenity laws. However, as Congressman JOHN MURPHY says,

This legislative approach focuses on the immensely important fact that such pornography materials are an unconscionable abuse, both mental and physical, on the children involved; our bill does not determine whether such materials are obscene.

H.R. 4572, also known as the Kildee-Murphy bill, calls for up to 20 years' imprisonment and/or a \$50,000 fine for the production of pornography involving children, or knowingly permitting a child under 16 years of age to be photographed in sexual acts. It also mandates a sentence of up to 15 years and/or a \$25,000 fine for shipping or selling such materials. Hearings on this matter have already begun in Congress and in many State and local legislative bodies.

Current reports reveal that measures to outlaw "child-porn" have been introduced in 23 State legislatures. In March of this year, the Illinois General Assembly overwhelmingly voted to consider a stringent measure that not only calls for prison sentences of up to 10 years for anyone found guilty of obscene conduct involving a child, but provides for jail terms of 1 to 10 years for anyone dealing in child pornography. It also prohibits judges from sentencing such a person to probation, periodic imprisonment, or conditional release.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support similar measures to insure the protection of our offspring and the morality of our Nation.

THE NEED FOR A RENEWED CHRISTIAN AMERICA

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in this age of realism we seem to have strayed far from our foundations. Seemingly, we have become more acquiring than inquiring, more material than spiritual, more clever than possessed with character, and more witty than wise. Our Bicentennial celebrations reminded us of our foundations, but even in those moments of reevaluation, little was said about the role of religion in the founding of this Nation. As my good friend and fellow Missourian, the Rev. Dr. Arthur C. Fulbright points out in his

March 13 sermon to the First United Methodist Church of Sikeston, Mo.:

Our fathers built this nation upon God and religion.

His sermon points to the great need for all of us to renew our idealism as a Christian republic and to regain our spiritual heritage. It is a sermon which I recommend to all of my colleagues as a challenge to us and to our Nation:

"THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY IS KNOWN! I!"

The Communist conspiracy is known. The diabolical Marxian philosophy of dialectical materialism has caused the historical record of Communism's amazingly rapid spread across much of Europe and Asia. Its tactics and techniques of conquest, subversion and infiltration; its atheistic immorality; its barbarities; and its ultimate objective—world conquest—is known and accepted by the majority of mankind!

Why the advancement of Communism? The great philosopher, Edmund Burke, once said: "If no certain laws, establishing invariable ground of hope and fear . . . keep the actions of men in a certain course, or direct them to a certain end . . . (then) the commonwealth itself would, in a few generations, crumble away, be disconnected into the dust and power of individuality."

What are the "certain laws, establishing invariable ground of hope and fear . . ." that have held society together "in a certain course?" These certain laws have been and are—the Ten Commandments! Here in the Ten Commandments we find stated the enduring principles upon which our civilization is based. We may call them God's laws, the natural law, the moral law, or the common law as they came to be known when translated in the rules which our ancestors established for governing the conduct of mankind.

Society is breaking down today because these enduring principles are no longer honored as rules for our conduct! Many of our citizens have no knowledge of the Bible. Many, indeed, have never heard of the Ten Commandments! How can we expect our society to prosper and endure—if the principles upon which it was founded and which gave it meaning and purpose are to be ignored and forgotten?!! Therefore, whatever power controls the mind will soon control the people!!!

If I am any student of history at all, I see World War III approaching. We can look for one sore spot after another erupting on the surface of this globe, little revolutions, keeping us and the United Nations in a constant stew running here and there putting out the fire, trying to restore peace and order. And all the while, the USSR and Red China, behind this smokescreen, are feverishly working to bring their economic order and nuclear stockpiles to a level comparable to ours.

Wishful thinkers keep hoping for a state of peace in the world, but there is no peace! The shameful Cuban disaster, the Vietnam defeated struggle, all Southeast Asia in ferment, Korea seething with apprehension, Red China pawing the shoreline looking longingly at Formosa, Africa foaming and steaming, Germany divided by an ugly wall, Israel and Arabian states in constant turmoil, Latin America in a perpetual state of unrest, demonstrations at home and abroad. Skirmishes, upheavals, riots, armed revolts on every continent and in every nook and corner of the earth . . . one festering sore after another coming to a head and all according to the Communist time-table!

In April 1975 the world took note of the shameful and appalling Communist take-over of Cambodia with their acts of murder and rape of a gentle people and land. The Communists murdered over one million Cam-

bodians in their take-over. The account of the full awesome truth about the new holocaust is revealed by two renowned writers, Mr. John Barron and Mr. Anthony Paul in their recent book, "Murder of a Gentle Land", the story is told as the Cambodians witnessed the Communist murder and rape of their gentle people.

There is a feeling that the present Soviet Government is somewhat less militarily belligerent than Red China, but no one who looks at the situation realistically suggests that there has ever been a significant change in the Russian objective. Their eventual aim is still World Domination! You recall what Lenin said: "As long as Capitalism and Socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph."

The adherents of Communism believe—and that belief is a strong conviction, a flaming passion—that our way of life is doomed to failure because of its weaknesses, which they see, but seemingly we are not able to accept and see; or if we do, we shrug our shoulders and disinterestedly pass by. Russia thinks she foresees the eventual decay of our democracy.

Please note the seven deadly sins that are destroying our nation:

1. Politics without principle;
2. Pleasure without conscience;
3. Knowledge without work;
4. Wages without labor;
5. Business without morality;
6. Science without humanity;
7. Worship without sacrifice!!!

What, then, is the over-all Marxian strategy?

1. Foment trouble throughout the world without becoming directly involved.
2. Sap the strength of the democratic nations. And while moral, spiritual and psychological decay is working within our democracy, she will continue to wear us and the Western World down by ingeniously planned uprisings in every part of the world.

3. The Communist chief purpose is to demoralize the Western World, to weaken and wear us down, waiting until we eventually crack up.

4. Then with one masterful stroke, having already infiltrated government, education, business and religion, start a bloody revolution.

Every student of Marxism knows that is the strategy! When we go into a declared war against World Communism, we will already be wearied, weakened and defeated within. That is the advantage the Communists want, and they are staking everything on getting it.

There it is—the Communist plot! In defending our way of life on many fronts we are speeding up its decay within. Then at the strategic moment Communism steps in for the kill. And that is what I am afraid is happening, which leads me now to the really serious thought in my address:

Could there be more truth than we are willing to admit in the Marxist appraisal of our democracy? Are there glaring weaknesses in our way of life which will jeopardize its chances for survival? Are we nearing a moral and spiritual breakdown?

I venture an answer:

Our Capitalistic system may be headed for a downfall, unless we re-think, re-organize and revitalize our whole economy. The old method of fair and friendly competition is dying simply because it has been emptied of the true Christian spirit and is now hollow and dry. My friends, when your profit motive becomes your all-consuming purpose to the exclusion of every humanitarian outlook, then dry-rot sets in and your capitalistic system takes a tumble. When materialistic and secularistic thinking supplants the essential Christian principle and the Christian in-

reach and out-reach of life, then the days of your economy are numbered. A materialistic humanistic philosophy which puts possessions before service and holds them to be more sacred than human welfare, you can't deny the dry-rot. We give the impression in America that only material things count. So on and on we try to out-bid Communism at the level of gross materialism. We forget that human greed is insatiable. You can never satisfy it. Even if we outbid Communism on that level of materialism, they have won, because it is the materialism that has won—not the spiritual ideals that so-called Christian America professes.

Who can deny that our American Democracy has fallen sick? My friends, we are not as Christian a nation as we rationalize ourselves into believing we are. And Communism knows that! Do you think Communism would dare tamper with our way of life if she thought we were as sold on it as we were our early American Fathers?

I think it is time for somebody to tell the truth! Fifty million Americans are avowedly Godless. And just how Christian are the 115 million Americans who statistically belong to somebody's church? How many of them actually practice the Golden Rule? How many of them stand four-square for righteousness and justice? How many of them attend church regularly? What percentage of them are in church today?

Rome survived about a thousand years. Greek civilization survived about 500 years. We are 200 years old, and unless we change the trend we may not live another fifty years as a civilization and a first class nation.

Our very existence as a sovereign nation is in jeopardy. A nation can carry its indebtedness. It can correct its errors in judgment. It can rebuild its physical wreckage after natural disaster. But history makes plain that immorality and Godlessness lead to destruction!

So you see, my friends, it isn't war with the Communists that I fear. It is the decay of our Christian civilization that I dread, which would be even worse than war. Unless we experience some kind of moral and religious awakening in this country, the Communists will accomplish their Godless aims with war.

Are we heading for World War III? We are heading for something worse—more disastrous—the collapse of our morals, the loss of our spiritual heritage, the loss of our idealism as a Christian republic.

What can we do? Can we save ourselves and our beloved America? Can we experience such an awakening that the Communists will be jolted out of their egotistical assumption that everything is going their way right down the line? Can we make ourselves strong within? Can we find that spiritual power that will give us the decided edge? Can we upset the Marxian time-table? Can we lead the world to a just and lasting peace?

YES! That is why this address is necessary.

First of all, this is a personal matter. The place to begin is with ourselves. We must humble ourselves. We must repent of our sins. We must learn to discipline ourselves and re-organize our lives and our philosophies about the traditional spiritual values and concepts of life. We must simplify our living, slow down our pace, settle our racial differences and get back into our churches and out into the world with as much Christian love as American money. We must give God the chance He needs and cannot have unless we let Him have it!

Here's our predicament. Here's our need. Here's our challenge, our chance. Here's our hope, society's hope, the world's hope, put together in one verse of Holy Scripture.

"If my people, who are called by my name shall humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."—II Chronicles 7:14

Either we are going to discipline ourselves for our own sake, for our nation's sake, and our world's sake, or else discipline will be imposed upon us from without. Men know right but do wrong. Men, free to worship God according to conscience, use that freedom not to worship God at all. Men, free to build a commonwealth, use their trained minds for exploiting others and set in motion forces which destroy democracy. Men who know the value of law become lawless. Men who want a peaceful world are not at peace in their own homes, in their churches, or in their communities. We produce too many citizens with more wit than wisdom, more cleverness than character—using liberty for license.

You know the truth: "Liberty is not the right to do what you choose. It is the responsibility of choosing to do what is right."

And that is where religion comes in. You must get back into the church and become a vital part of its effort to save our society through Jesus Christ and the gospel. That may not be all of the solution, but it is a definite and indispensable part of it.

Caesar built a civilization upon power, and it failed. The medo-Persians built a great nation, but they drank their way to doom, and that civilization failed. Egypt flourished until she forgot God, and diminished into obscurity. Greece, under Alexander conquered the world, but Alexander couldn't conquer himself and died in a drunken orgy. Rome was once the proud center of the world, but luxury and lust ate at the center of her life, and she perished.

Our fathers built this nation upon God and religion. Do you recall that picture of George Washington at Valley Forge? His little army was almost starving and freezing to death. Everything they held dear was at stake. They were fighting against insurmountable odds. But out there in the snow was George Washington on his knees, praying to God for guidance. That was the spirit that built America! That has been the spirit that sustained America. That will be the spirit that will save America!!!—Amen.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR C. FULBRIGHT, Th. D.,
United Methodist Minister.

TUNA/PORPOISE CONTROVERSY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, next week, we will be considering H.R. 6970, a bill that will provide some measure of relief to our tuna fishermen while going far toward reducing porpoise mortality.

Recently, the Washington Post, in an editorial, made comment on the tuna/porpoise controversy and took exception to the actions of the chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

In an effort to set the record straight and to place accurate information at the disposal of my colleagues—particularly in view of the fact that tomorrow this question will be brought before us, I would like to include Chairman Mur-

phy's reply to the Post editorial as an extension of my remarks.

PORPOISES, TUNA BOATS AND A NET OF FACTS
(By John M. Murphy)

It is hard to determine where to begin the corrections to The Post's May 15 editorial "Save the Porpoises," which attacked my tuna/porpoise amendments. However, I think I will start with the pejorative implication that I was "caught" by the tuna fleet. I was certainly not caught by the fleet, but by a net of facts, a net successfully eluded by The Post. I found the facts after a personal investigation of the affected areas of the country, months of committee meetings and after reading a hearing record replete with testimony, which The Post obviously did not bother to read.

First, the tuna men did not "beach [their] own fleet" to put pressure on Congress. The government failed to issue permits to fish using the dolphin-following technique until April 15, 1977. When it did, the government allowed a catch of 59,000 dolphins—but not one dolphin of the species known as the Eastern Spinner. As a result, the tuna boats that tried to operate under the 1977 federal regulations found themselves in violation of the law if they caught one of these dolphins, which they use to spot and catch tuna in the first half of the fishing year. They sailed home "partly" in protest, but mainly because the regulations were not workable.

My bill calls for an allowable take of 6,500 of these particular dolphins. At a recent hearing Dr. Robert White, the head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, presented evidence that the government now agrees that the allowable take of the Eastern Spinner should be at the 6,500 level. White's revised scientific data have put the total allowable dolphin take at 69,000 over the next six months, with projected increases in the stocks of dolphins in the coming years.

The Post says the tuna industry has been slow in installing the proper nets and using the proper techniques for saving the dolphin. But the editorial fails to point out that it was the U.S. fleet that pioneered the fishing techniques that reduce the dolphin mortality rate. It was a fisherman who developed the backdown procedure used by the entire tuna fleet long before the Marine Mammal Protection Act, for which I voted and worked, ever became law. The Post implies that the fleet objects to this procedure. The fine-mesh nets that The Post referred to were invented by a fisherman named Medina; they are on 70 per cent of the boats in the fleet and will be on all the tuna boats as quickly as they are produced.

But most important, the editorial ignored a judicial interpretation of the law that put tens of thousands of people out of work. My amendments can help these thousands of cannery workers and ordinary seamen, who have been without paychecks since November 1976, to go back to work without threatening the depletion of the dolphin population. Most of these workers are minority and female, and in many cases they are the heads of households. They provide 30 per cent of the fish protein eaten by American citizens. And this inexpensive protein is about to become exorbitant in price or even nonexistent if the present stalemate is allowed to continue. It's time these people went back to work.

You refer to "administration" legislation. I waited for eight months for an administration solution, which by their own admission was finalized under pressure from committee hearings. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has conducted endless

hearings and meetings without coming up with a bill. Sen. Alan Cranston's apparently acceptable compromise was wrecked by an intransigent group of environmentalists. It was then and only then that I decided to take action. My bill picks up the Cranston compromise. We are well on the way to solving this controversy. Editorials such as the one in The Post only exacerbate the problem and continue the polarization of the radical elements on both sides of the issue.

Finally—and this is the unkindest cut of all—The Post promotes the myth that the American tuna fleet cannot transfer to a foreign country and that, even if it did, a U.S. import ban would solve the problem. These old arguments have been discarded for weeks. The fleet is not made up of boats alone. It is made up of highly skilled captains and crews. They are the ones who are preparing to go to Latin America, and the foreigners would be only too happy to supply the vessels for these expert American fishermen. And in a world that is increasingly devoid of a cheap source of protein, it would be a Pyrrhic victory indeed for this country to ban an inexpensive protein source that everyone else in the world wants—and will buy.

SHOULD THERE BE GREATER REGULATION OF LAND USE AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVELS—
BY BERNARD H. SIEGAN

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial issues before Congress in recent years—and again this year—has been the role of the Federal and State governments in land-use planning and control. The controversy is not going to go away.

Caught up in the give and take of lobbying efforts either for or against greater Federal or State roles, most authors, no matter how knowledgeable, lose sight of the fundamental, core questions. That is why I was impressed with, an article I read over the past weekend by Bernard H. Siegan, one of our country's most respected and outstanding authorities on zoning and land use. He has avoided the pitfall which catches other commentators and has addressed himself squarely to those fundamental, core issues.

Perhaps I can summarize Mr. Siegan's conclusions most accurately by quoting directly from this article:

We have had four or five different zoning systems or strategies in this country. Each has been introduced with what has turned out to be greatly inflated rhetoric as to what it would accomplish. And each in turn has for the most part, failed to meet the expectations created by that rhetoric. The result, each time, is a new effort at the drawing boards, resulting in more and severer rules and regulations which, experience suggests, is not likely to be more successful than the previous program.

The question arises, can these widely recognized problems be solved by state or federal land use regulations? The simple answer is that political pressures moral and legal corruption and bad laws are not confined to local government. A second answer comes

from the experience of regulation in this country. That record has been an extremely poor one.

The proponents of higher land use regulation are doing what seems to come instinctively these days, to ask for more or a different kind of government regulation when the existing ones have failed. This attitude represents what Dr. Samuel Johnson called, when speaking of another endeavor, "a triumph of hope over experience."

Not only would state or federal land use regulations not solve the many problems seen by its proponents, it would be harmful to our society.

The situation demands deregulation. We should start dismantling the regulatory processes which harm the economy and prevent people from acquiring the best and most desirable shelter. There surely should be no greater regulation of land use at either the state or federal level.

Mr. Speaker, the complete text of the article follows:

SHOULD THERE BE GREATER REGULATION OF LAND USE AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVELS?

(By Bernard H. Siegan)

My position is that there should be less regulation of land use at both the state and federal levels of government. The existing problems of land use can best be solved by deregulation, not increased regulation. I will be speaking about area-wide regulation and not specific land use control proposals.

Let me begin by referring briefly to the experience of zoning in this country, so that we can better understand the operation of land use controls. We have a very rich history of zoning regulation, even just including the part the public knows about. Area-wide land use controls arrived in 1916 in the form of the New York zoning resolution, the country's first zoning ordinance. It was a modest ordinance containing three use districts: residential, commercial and unrestricted; five classes of height districts and three classes of area districts. At my last count, New York had 66 zoning districts, and a host of other controls never conceived of by the draftsmen of its original ordinance. A similar story applies to other cities. Small, modest ordinances in time become very complex and complicated ones. One reason for this is of course the change in conditions, techniques and thinking that occurs over the years and is reflected in our laws. But there are two other explanations for the uncontrolled growth of zoning.

The first is that zoning has been the story of unrealized expectations. We have now had four or five different zoning systems or strategies in this country. Each has been introduced with what has turned out to be greatly inflated rhetoric as to what it would accomplish. And each in turn has for the most part, failed to meet the expectations created by that rhetoric. The result, each time, is a new effort at the drawing boards, resulting in more and severer rules and regulations which, experience suggests, is not likely to be more successful than the previous program.

The current situation in San Diego provides an example. The existing zoning system has been deemed inadequate and a great many promises are being made as to what the new proposed five tier zoning policy will accomplish. One gets the impression that even if only a portion of these promises materialize, this city will surely be another Camelot.

Another reason for the large growth in zoning regulations is that the process is basically one of resolving differences between various special interest groups in the community. No matter how perfect the zoning plan, some people will be helped and others

hurt by it. The losers, experience shows, will immediately after passage of the ordinance, start doing those things that will make them winners. Owners of property will seek to rezone it, so that it will be worth more. Homeowners and conservationists will try to downzone property and civic groups will try to overcome the inadequacies they discover. The courts may also cause significant changes to be made. It will not take long before the original plan has been reduced to not much more than an historical document, having grafted upon it innumerable amendments. The dominant factors in zoning have been public pressures, political pressures and just plain politics. Matters such as highest and best use of the land, conservation of the land, satisfying consumer demands and sound planning have been subordinate and often nonexistent considerations.

The question arises, can these widely recognized problems be solved by state or federal land use regulations? The simple answer is that political pressures, moral and legal corruption and bad laws are not confined to local government. A second answer comes from the experience of regulation in this country. That record has been an extremely poor one. The most immediate example is the regulation of airlines. President Carter, Senator Kennedy, Ralph Nader and Milton Friedman all agree upon substantial economic deregulation of the airline industry.

The evidence is rather clear that airline regulation has been harmful to the nation. A study by the General Accounting Office has concluded that a reduction in federal regulation of airlines during a six year period would have resulted in fare reductions ranging from 22 to 52 percent. The lower fares would have resulted in savings to domestic air passengers on the order of \$1.4 billion to \$1.8 billion per year. The Carter administration has now also proposed deregulation of the ICC which controls rail and truck rates, thereby joining Ralph Nader and Milton Friedman who have long held this view.

Even in the area of health and safety, it is most questionable how effective regulation has been. Consider the case of the FDA, and I do not refer to the current flap about saccharine. Some very extensive studies have shown that while the FDA is keeping out of the market bad drugs, it may be excluding an even greater number of beneficial drugs, such as those which might help us relieve or control heart disease and cancer.

There have now been numerous studies of the many regulatory agencies and many of them have been printed in the *Journal of Law and Economics* published by the University of Chicago Law School. Professor Ronald Coase, editor of the *Journal*, has this to say about these studies, and I quote:

"The main lesson to be drawn from these studies is clear; they all tend to suggest that the regulation is either ineffective or when it has a noticeable impact, that on balance the effect is bad, so that consumers obtain a worse product or a higher priced product or both, as a result of the legislation. Indeed, this result is found so uniformly as to create a puzzle; one would expect to find in all these studies at least some government programs that do more good than harm."

A recent article in the *Bell Journal*, favorable incidentally to regulation, written by Economics Professor Victor Goldberg, affirmed Professor Coase's conclusion in this manner:

"The failure of regulation has been widely chronicled in recent years. Among economists the disdain and contempt for regulation is nearly universal; if effective, it is thought to be pernicious, and if ineffective, a waste of resources."

Accordingly, based upon the history of

zoning and other regulation, the lesson should be clear that additional regulation of land use should not be imposed unless there is extremely strong cause for it and even then, only if it is very likely to accomplish its purpose.

Using these criteria, existing proposals for state and federal land use controls fail. To demonstrate this, let me discuss with you the objectives of the principal groups seeking such regulation. These include the environmentalists, egalitarian-civil rights groups and a portion of the development industry.

The environmentalists seek to carefully screen and/or prevent development in areas considered environmentally sensitive. What are environmentally sensitive lands? The definition is not as simple as may appear. This was evident in the Bill sponsored by Congressman Morris Udall and others, which would have partially subsidized state land use programs, and which nearly passed the House in 1974. That bill's definition of areas of environmental concern was so broad many of us thought it included most of the land West of the Mississippi river. In a subsequent bill introduced by Udall and others in 1975, the definition was refined and among other things, eliminated agricultural land, but it still involved a great amount of territory. I quote to you just one portion of the definition contained in the later bill, Section 302(A), designating as areas of critical state concern the following: "natural or historic lands with significant scientific, educational, recreational or aesthetic values, such as significant shorelands of rivers, lakes and streams, rare or valuable eco-systems and geological formations, significant wildlife habitats and fragile areas. . . ." The language would still cover large quantities of land, and is subject to considerable expansion.

However, regardless of the language or intent of its sponsors, it is not likely that all development will or can be prohibited within these areas. What will happen in all probability is much more of what is already occurring under local zoning. There would be less development, more land would be used for urban purposes and real estate prices and rents would tend to increase. However, relatively few of the critical areas would be preserved in their natural setting.

There are two basic reasons for this. First are the "taking" and due process provisions of federal and state constitutions which limit the extent to which private property can be regulated. The second reason is that the regulatory process tends to solve controversies through some compromise formula, an approach which would be reinforced in this situation by the constitutional provisions I have mentioned.

We tend to be sanguine about compromise under regulation and ignore its realities. In that context, compromise may be likened to throwing a fifteen foot line to someone drowning twenty feet out, while claiming to be meeting him more than halfway.

The history of California's coastline regulation established in 1972 by public initiative, tells us more specifically how land use controls would probably operate in areas of critical environmental concern. Bear with me briefly while I present some statistics.

In 1973, over 6200 permit applications were received by the six regional commissions given permit power under the coastal zoning law. Of these, about 5200 or 83 percent, were granted. In 1974, over 4700 permit applications were received and approximately 4400 (or 94 percent) were granted. To get a better understanding of what these numbers mean, Professor Bruce Johnson has made an analysis of the operation of the Santa Barbara Coastal Commission on which he served. During the first fourteen months in the life of that Commission, it approved

95 percent of the applications received for single family dwellings, but granted only 60 percent of the single family units requested on these applications. While 77 percent of the multi-family applications received approval, only 51 percent of the units applied for were allowed. What all of these figures mean is that if a developer applies for a permit to build 100 units on his five acre tract adjoining the ocean, he will, after considerable delay, red tape, maneuvering, arguing and possibly a nervous breakdown, have his request whittled down to roughly around 70 units. That's what is referred to in regulation as "balancing".

The five acres in our example will still remain in private ownership and not normally accessible to the public, except possibly for an easement to the coastline that would be required, but which would have more theoretical than practical value. It is questionable that better views would be provided since the buildings might also have to be aesthetically compromised. The question that now presents itself is what happens to the thirty units that were disallowed? One probable answer is that these, along with other disallowed units, represent unsatisfied demand and would in time, cause greater or more rapid development of the coast, something entirely inconsistent with the aims of the initiative. It is of course, possible that the thirty units would never be built, in which case, society will have lost the benefits of approximately three-fourths of a million dollars worth of construction for business, employment, tax revenues and housing supply and there will be less housing.

Possibly these 30 units may find their way into existing vacant land within a developed city. But they would then reduce the amount of land available there for other projects. Another alternative is that the disallowed units will increase demand for building in rural, undeveloped areas at the expense of other environmentally sensitive land, or of land used or suitable for agriculture, grazing and mining. The result in this case would be more spread and sprawl, exactly those horrors from which regulation is supposed to protect us. But this consequence is not an unusual one these days. Slow and controlled growth policies have caused development to leapfrog the areas so restricted and sprawl and spread further and further into areas that are or should be used for other purposes such as farming, grazing and mining.

A recent article on Austin, Texas in the Texas Monthly, describes the situation very succinctly. It concludes the following about the growth policies of the Austin City Council:

"The irony is that the most anti-growth council in Austin history may have done more to bring about urban sprawl than did any of the pro-developer councils that preceded it. Over 75 percent of the homes built in the Austin metropolitan area last year were outside the city's extraterritorial jurisdiction."

Such a pattern, while perhaps not always as drastic would be likely for areas of critical environmental concern in demand for development and much more than just the California coastline would be involved. Development would take place, but with less intensity of use and while there would be more open space, it would be privately owned and not normally accessible to the public. I submit that the proposed state controls would accomplish more of what the proponents say they want to prevent: instead of conserving a precious resource, more of it will be misused and wasted.

Developers have not been blind to the regulatory dynamics. In October 1975, an article in the San Diego BCA Builder advised its readers on how to handle the situation, and I quote:

"It is generally advisable to be prepared to give something up. Don't go into the public hearing with a bare minimum proposal. Be ready to barter something away."

Many developers can be expected to try to beat the game by asking for more than they really want and that would mean that frequently the entire process would accomplish little more than waste the public's time and money and further undermine the credibility of government.

As I indicated, some civil rights groups are also demanding state land use controls. They want the state to require all or most municipalities to allow development of projects catering to minorities and low and moderate income families. They condemn exclusionary zoning and argue that it can only be overcome by state or federal laws.

One problem with their approach is that zoning or land use regulation will not build housing and the housing they are talking about requires government subsidies which are not very plentiful these days. Nor are they likely to succeed in obtaining the kind of land use regulations they want. Most legislatures are suburban/rural dominated, or strongly beholden to such forces, and they are not about to force low and moderate income housing down the throats of unwilling municipalities. The State of New York provides an example. Its Urban Development Corporation had for many years the power to override local zoning ordinances and develop low income housing in suburbia. When it finally attempted to implement this power by announcing a number of projects, it was stripped of it by the New York legislature in 1973. There is one state however, that has made an effort to deal with this problem, but its results are minimal and possibly counterproductive.

In 1969 Massachusetts passed an anti-snob zoning law under which developers of low income projects could appeal local denials to a state agency. In the first five years under this statute, 27 comprehensive building permits were issued for 2281 units, which constitutes even less than tokenism, considering the state's population is under six million and contains 350 cities and towns. Despite the encouragement of this law, developers have found it too difficult to obtain the subsidies and finances necessary to build the housing and fight battles with City Hall.

It might be said that even this number is better than nothing. Such a conclusion is highly questionable. Cities and towns that contain or have zoned for low income housing are not reticent about disclosing this and righteously claiming that consequently they have fulfilled their obligation to mankind. They say they should now be left alone to do as they wish with respect to the balance of their zoning. Some courts have accepted this line. Thus the Federal Appeals Court upholding the severe growth restrictions of Petaluma, California, in part justified its decision on the basis of the small amount of zoning for lower income people provided in the city's plan.

The court noted that the city had allowed annually for about fifty units of such housing and somehow was not deterred by the fact that the development controls that it validated excluded probably ten to fifteen times that number of conventional units. This is a very poor trade-off for the housing consumer, poor and rich alike, especially considering there is little funding available for subsidized housing. But the idea has politically attractive features which could be implemented in state controlled zoning, and create an even more exclusionary result.

Some of the development industry wants the state and federal governments to control zoning in the hope that they will provide better for them than the localities have. These developers believe that state controls will bring about a kind of one-stop service so they would only have to go to one state

agency for a development permit. All the evidence suggests that this is no more than a pipe dream, although it was very seriously advanced by supporters of the Udall bill. State land use controls will bring with it the plethora of state agencies that would have to pass upon development proposals much as now occurs at the local level. The problem for most developers probably would be compounded, not relieved.

The proponents of higher level land use regulations are doing what seems to come instinctively these days, to ask for more or a different kind of government regulation when the existing ones have failed. This attitude represents what Dr. Samuel Johnson called, when speaking of another endeavor, "a triumph of hope over experience."

Not only would state or federal land use regulations not solve the many problems seen by its proponents, it would be harmful to our society. Consider how it would affect the development industry. At the present time, the complexity of local regulations has forced many small builders to drop out. They do not have the funds to hire lawyers and experts that are so necessary these days for those who have to cope with zoning. The troubles of this group would be intensified when a new set of regulators emerged at the state or federal capitals. The bigger and wealthier builders are in a much better position to hire the needed help. As a result, we might in time lose the very great efficiency, creativity and imagination of the small builder, and that would indeed be a serious loss for the country.

Faced by criticism of this sort, both Udall bills for national land use policy contained provisions safeguarding property rights. These provisions stated that nothing in the Act "shall be construed to enhance or diminish the rights of owners of property as provided by the Constitution of the U.S. and constitution and laws of the state in which the property is located." For the Rockefellers and Gettys, such a provision may be comforting. But for the small landowner it is close to meaningless. No matter how wicked, reprehensible and confiscatory a regulation is, a bolt from heaven will not strike it dead. It can only be declared unconstitutional or illegal by a court of law, and this means that the owner must be in a position to use costly and lengthy court processes to sue for such a ruling. From the moment the regulation is even contemplated—perhaps just a glimmer in a planner's eye—those financially able will begin employing lawyers and experts to protect their interests.

The big owners and developers have the capabilities and will often modify or defeat regulations. While the state authorities may find it difficult to overcome such people, they will easily succeed against those who cannot fight back. The latter group may have to settle for lower prices, await future appreciation, or just pray that someday the meek will inherit the earth. In other words, state and federal controls will operate to do exactly the reverse of what is written and intended in the Udall bill. The regulatory process will, in effect, enhance property rights for the wealthier owners and diminish those of the less affluent owners.

Finally, let us consider the impact of additional state and federal land use regulation upon the country. In spite of the dangers of refueling inflation, the national government is spending billions upon billions of dollars to reduce unemployment, stimulate the economy and increase housing starts. Housing in particular has been badly hit during the last three years with starts substantially decreased. At the national level, the emphasis is clearly on greater economic growth and any reduction in gross national product such as came to light with the recently revised figures for the last quar-

ter of 1976 seems to send shivers through Congress and the administration.

A contrary perspective prevails at much of the local levels of government. There, through the use of zoning laws, efforts have been under way to manage, slow or even stop, growth. The impact of the billions being spent nationally to promote growth are being countered by local efforts to restrain it.

These policies at the local level are not only harmful to the economy, but they hurt the most primary of environmental concerns: employment, better housing and better housing conditions. The people desperately in need of a better quality of life are those who are unemployed and living in substandard housing. Under our system, only private industry can help alleviate these troubles, but its efforts are currently being shackled by the innumerable restrictions and regulations of local government. New regulations at higher levels will only add to the problem. The proposed state or federal regulations will cause a large number of new rules to be superimposed on a large number of existing rules and at the very least, that will result in confusion and uncertainty for owners and land developers. Two or three government levels will then have a piece of the zoning pie. It may be necessary to hire experts in the locality, in the state capitol and possibly, if national land use is enacted, in Washington, as well, just to determine what the new rules are.

The situation demands deregulation. We should start dismantling the regulatory processes which harm the economy and prevent people from acquiring the best and most desirable shelter. There surely should be no greater regulation of land use at either the state or federal level.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 24, I missed several recorded votes because of previous commitments in my district.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on roll No. 277; to resolve into the Committee of the Whole to consider H.R. 6884, the International Security Assistance Act of 1977.

I would have voted "no" on roll No. 278 on the Ichord amendment to delete the provisions establishing a South Africa Special Requirements Fund and to provide \$100 million in security supporting assistance for the fund.

I would have voted "yes" on roll No. 279 on the Bonker substitute—for the Bauman amendment—to strike out "majority rule" as a precondition for countries to receive aid from the South African Special Requirements Fund.

I would have voted "yes" on roll No. 280 on the Harkin amendment to reduce foreign military sales authorizations by \$103 million.

I would have voted "no" on roll No. 281 to recommit the bill.

I would have voted "yes" on roll No. 282, final passage of the bill, H.R. 6884.

With respect to the bill, H.R. 6161, the Clean Air Act amendments, I would have voted "yes" on roll No. 283 to adopt

House Resolution 589, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6161.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this Monday I had the distinct pleasure and honor to attend the 113th commencement of Gallaudet College. Since 1864, this school has provided hope and opportunity to thousands of persons who have impaired hearing or are totally deaf.

Along with my good friend and colleague from California (Mr. RYAN), I have the privilege of serving on the Board of Directors of Gallaudet. I commend the president, Dr. Edward C. Merrill, the administration, and the faculty for the outstanding work they are doing. I also congratulate the 204 graduates in the Class of 1977 and wish them the best of luck in the future.

The commencement address was given by the Honorable Jack Ashley, a member of the British Parliament. Mr. Ashley, while in Parliament, lost his hearing, because of an ear infection after an operation. He has continued to serve in Parliament by using his wife as an oral interpreter and using a palantype—a system which makes use of court reporting—stenotype—to present a phonetic display for a deaf person. In his address, Mr. Ashley cites the deprivation of educational opportunity and individual human rights for the millions of deaf persons in the world, and calls on the graduates to be ambassadors of all deaf people. The text of his address follows:

ADDRESS PRESENTED BY MR. JACK ASHLEY

It is a great privilege to attend this notable occasion and I am deeply appreciative of the honour.

Anyone the world over who is deaf, or interested in the problems of deafness, would welcome the opportunity to visit Gallaudet, for it is a world famous institution of great renown.

I know it is world famous because wherever I have travelled—in Europe, Africa or Asia, the name and the fame of Gallaudet have been warmly acknowledged.

This fame owes much to your ambassadors from the College itself. At a recent conference in London, opened by our Prime Minister, your President, Dr. Merrill, spoke with eloquence and pride of the Gallaudet legacy. It was, if I may say so, impressive testimony to the achievements of the College.

In the past, Gallaudet has accommodated students from many nations—some from Britain—and today they include people from no less than 27 countries; and it is through them, also, that people of all nations learn of the work of Gallaudet.

I personally know of Gallaudet simply because I am deaf. For any man or woman afflicted by deafness looks to this international beacon of educational light—however dark may be their own personal tunnel.

Gallaudet undoubtedly stands at the pinnacle of the educational pyramid of deaf people throughout the world. But this pyramid—despite the eminence of its pinnacle—is malformed as a result of its very

low and enormously wide base. Millions of deaf people throughout the world are denied educational opportunity and are therefore burdened with the dual handicap of deafness and educational deprivation.

They are no tiny, underprivileged minority. The number of deaf people in the world is greater than that of the whole population of the U.S.A. In fact it is greater than the population of any nation in the world, except India or China; and the vast majority of them receive a much lower standard of education than the average in their own countries.

It is against this sombre background that the legacy of Gallaudet, and the achievements of the College, should be viewed—and it is only in this context that their true nature can be appreciated. It is, by any standard, deeply impressive. But to have surmounted such formidable obstacles as those which face all deaf people is a dazzling institutional and individual accomplishment, and one of which they can be very proud.

Of course Gallaudet graduates will go forth and face the same problems and prejudices as confronting deaf people all over the world. There may be some slight national variations but, in the main, deaf people are subject to discrimination simply because of their disability.

It is remarkable that mankind, which can recognise and respond to great national disasters with understanding and generosity, fails to appreciate and alleviate the myriad personal disasters of deafness.

This failure is based on ignorance, which in turn is based on fear. It is fear of the unknown, because the problems of deaf people are largely unknown. They are not amenable to simple exposition, still less to easy solutions.

The graduates of Gallaudet, will be better equipped than most to face these unequal odds, to mitigate the ignorance and to dispel the fear. They will become not only the ambassadors of Gallaudet, but the ambassadors of all deaf people—carrying with them the hopes, the trust, and the aspirations of millions who share this disability.

Each man or woman will tackle these problems, and make their contributions in their own individual way. By virtue of their individuality, nurtured and cherished at Gallaudet, they will help to dispel the common illusion that all deaf people are the same—the myth that they are an inferior, homogeneous group to be lumped together and brushed aside.

The graduates can help society to see a deaf person as an individual who happens to have a disability, rather than as a member of a disabled group who happens to be a person. They will thereby not only add to collective wisdom; they will help lighten the burden of those who are to follow.

An acceptance of the value of individuality is crucial to the future of all deaf people. For far too long they have been denied rights which are part of their natural heritage. Anyone concerned with deafness must place a high priority on insisting that full rights be accorded to all deaf people.

This claim for full human rights has a hallowed tradition. Men and women have fought throughout the centuries to establish their rights—most of them motivated by the highest ideals—and seeking to redress fundamental grievances.

This tradition has been renewed and revitalised by President Carter. By his insistence on full human rights, he has made a major contribution, and won the support of all free men throughout the world. His is a noble and altruistic ideal to which we should all aspire because wherever the rights of men and women are diminished, for political, economic, social or religious reasons—or because they are disabled—so mankind itself is diminished.

The clarion call of the President of the United States has not only been heard in the U.S.A.; it has found an echo in all parts of the globe. And it is a call with special relevance to all deaf people because their particular disability deprives them of vital human rights.

It is a regrettable fact that deafness is an unfashionable disability provoking derision and scorn rather than the sympathy and understanding accorded to other disabilities. Deafness robs men of their rights; deprives women of their due; and denies children their destiny. Deafness is destructive. It destroys human rights as effectively, yet more silently and with greater subtlety, than the most perverse dictatorship. For deafness results in second class citizenship—which by definition means deprivation of human rights.

In many nations there are people fighting to preserve and extend the rights of deaf people. In Britain, we have the Royal National Institute of the Deaf doing outstanding work in this field. The British Broadcasting Corporation also plays an important part with special weekly programmes like "News Review" with captions—all to help deaf people. These are important and heart-warming developments which are furthering a great change in the lives of deaf people which I can now sense in Britain.

In the U. S. A., you have Gallaudet College and it is no coincidence that the College has established a special Center for Law and the Deaf, advocating equal rights for all deaf people. By pursuing the rights of one deaf person, we enhance the rights of all deaf people under the law. That is a splendid aim, and the commendable objective, of Gallaudet, and many people appreciate it.

Gallaudet helps in individual cases to secure legal rights—yet simultaneously accepts international responsibilities to establish the rights of many others through its International Center. In doing so, it recognizes the basic truth that justice—like truth—is indivisible; and justice for deaf people means including those millions who do not have the same wonderful opportunities as the graduates of Gallaudet.

Most of the major problems of deaf people in every country derive from adverse public attitudes—and these can best be changed by deaf people themselves. This is not to say that they should behave in a uniform way. Every individual must decide for himself how to deal with the difficulties—whether to face the challenge of mixing in public or be content with the smaller circle of his family and other deaf people, with whom he can communicate easily.

Neither is more laudable than the other; they are just different. It would be as wrong to attempt to persuade one deaf man to mix in public against his will, as it would be to try to cajole another to segregate himself from others he wished to join. Individual choice is, and must remain, the main consideration.

Those who choose to make their way in public will find, at first, that deafness deprives a person not only of his hearing but of his confidence. This is due largely to the condescending attitude of many people to the deaf, motivated partly by a natural feeling of superiority to any disabled person, and partly because lack of confidence is easily detected, even by the most ungracious, and quickly exploited.

There is, of course, no simple answer, and it is pointless to urge a timid deaf person to act like a lion. But deaf people should never permit patronage, nor allow abuse, because of their disability. Nor should they allow the public to judge them by their deafness rather than their personalities. If deaf people lose confidence in themselves, they cannot expect to win confidence from others.

This is perhaps the most difficult battle

of all—especially in the early years, and for those deaf people venturing into an indifferent or hostile environment. They face a kaleidoscopic pattern of life—a rapidly changing picture of despair and hope; occasionally depressing with failure but frequently shining with promise.

I believe that there is a new public awakening to the problems of deaf people—and a realization that these need not lie, as they have lain so long, in the shadows of public and private indifference. Deaf people can now rely on some of the people some of the time—but they cannot rely on all of the people all of the time.

To fulfill their own potentialities, deaf people must take a firm hand in their own destiny—relying on neither friend nor foe to determine their future. There is the same birthright as other human beings', to life and laughter, joy and sorrow, failure or achievement. Their handicap is but one more hazard in the steep climb of life; and by determination to surmount it, they can win the glittering prizes of happiness, accomplishment and fulfillment.

And for those graduating today there is a very special advantage. Whatever they do, wherever they go, they can claim with truth and pride, "I come from Gallaudet."

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, May 28, 1977, is the 59th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day. It is my pleasure to take this opportunity, as Americans and the citizens of the world again pause in remembrance of that solemn occasion, to pay tribute to the memory of outstanding Armenian nationalists and leaders throughout the annals of history. We can also salute their proud counterparts of today, those who continue to display the indefatigable spirit of their very brave people in the fight for human rights. Their account merits our attention. Their valor is worthy of our esteem.

It is terribly sad that one instantly recalls the horrifying genocide of 1.5 million Armenians, living under Turkish rule from 1915 to 1917, when thinking of the story of these noble people. We reflect on that experience with repulsion, but such atrocities are truly hard for us to fully comprehend as a people who have always lived with liberty.

Americans have been allied with the Armenian struggle for many years. It is not widely known that our President, Woodrow Wilson, has emerged through the chronicle of their survival as a true champion and ally of the Armenians. I would like to share some of that remarkable history, and a special American contribution, with you and my colleagues here today.

When the Russian Army withdrew from the Caucasian front in October of 1917, an ill-equipped Armenian Army of refugees and volunteers from abroad fought the invading Turkish divisions to a standstill. That heroic feat prevented the Turks from seizing the Baku oilfields for the use of the German war machine.

These military successes led directly to the establishment on May 28, 1918, of the independent Republic of Armenia.

Two years later, a joint attack by Turkish Kemalist forces and Russian forces led to the destruction of Armenian freedom. This overwhelming, mortal takeover occurred despite all of the promises and assurances of the Allies.

The United States was moved to recognize the free Armenian Republic of 1918 to 1920, the only government of that nation to be accorded that status by our country. The high regard and importance with which the United States viewed Armenia led to an American mandate to intercede. As the major part of that effort, President Wilson arbitrated the boundaries of that small, but fearless, nation with Turkey, pursuant to the Sevres Treaty.

As Americans take the time to celebrate Armenian Independence Day, we, as the greatest freedom-loving people in the world, should strengthen our bonds with all those who similarly enjoy freedom. At the same time, we must renew our commitment to all those people who continue to struggle under the bonds of oppression.

The courageous people of Armenia have spent far longer than 59 years searching for true liberty. Their struggle has ensued through centuries of persecution and ruthless domination. Yet, throughout these long years, the freedom-loving spirit of the Armenian people has remained undaunted, and today they continue their struggle for freedom.

I am very proud to be considered a friend of the cause of Armenian freedom by my constituents of Armenian heritage, and particularly their leadership, as represented by the Armenian National Committee and their chairman, Harry Derderian.

The Armenian-American citizens of the United States have contributed much to our Nation, and for that we are grateful. It remains our hope that freedom may yet return to Armenia so that next May 28 we can truly celebrate Armenian Independence Day.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO LEADS THE NATION

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of bringing deserved recognition to the University of New Mexico as being No. 1 in the Nation of major State universities as the leader on all levels, including undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs in percentage of minority student participation.

I believe that the University of New Mexico should stand out as a model for other institutions of higher learning in order to provide the necessary education and experience to the numerous minority students willing and wanting to attend college.

There are many factors which must be

present to successfully carry out the functions of a multicultural university. These include cooperation and positive action by both the University and the State government, and most importantly—the large minority groups that live in New Mexico.

At this time, I would like to share with you a summary of the Presidential progress report on ethnic minorities which includes the latest available national statistics:

The University of New Mexico is the national leader among major state universities and colleges in providing educational opportunities for minority students, University of New Mexico President William E. Davis said at a news conference today.

Referring to a presidential progress report on minority educational opportunities Davis said that according to the latest available national statistics (1974) undergraduate minority enrollment at UNM is approximately 22 per cent, while the national average is 7.1 per cent.

The 1974 U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare survey also shows a wide gap between national averages and enrollment at UNM in graduate and professional schools.

UNM's population of minority graduate students is 15.69 per cent with the national average 7.11 per cent.

UNM's professional school minority enrollment is 23.09 per cent with the national average 8.15 per cent.

When compared to other major universities with large minority populations the record shows UNM still emerging as the leader.

At the University of Texas at Austin, with an enrollment of 39,048 students, the Hispanic enrollment is 2613 students or 6.6 per cent.

The two major institutions in the University of California system, UCLA and California at Berkeley, also lag behind the Hispanic student enrollment at UNM.

UCLA this year has a student enrollment of 29,055 domestic students and a total of 1890 Hispanic students or 6.5 per cent. California at Berkeley, with a total enrollment of 28,343 students shows an Hispanic enrollment of 977 students or 3.5 per cent.

The University of New Mexico has an Hispanic enrollment of 4684 students or approximately 22 per cent.

While UNM is number one among all major state universities in minorities as a percentage of enrollment, the state as a whole—that is, all of the institutions of higher education in New Mexico—ranks second in percentage of minorities enrolled among total student population in all but one category.

In graduate level education New Mexico ranks fifth nationally. UNM, as a major state university, is well ahead of comparable institutions in other states in service to minorities, but smaller institutions in other states absorb a greater percentage of the total minority student population than is the case in New Mexico.

During 1975-76, the latest year for which accurate figures are available, UNM awarded a total of \$10,000,000 in grants, scholarships, loans and work-study arrangements.

Of that amount, 45 per cent or \$4,500,000 went to minority students who represented approximately 25 per cent of the student body.

That means that minority students received nearly half of the financial aid distributed at UNM while representing only about a quarter of the total enrollment.

During the same year UNM allocated another \$4,600,000 to minority-emphasis recruitment-retention programs and put more than \$140,000 into three ethnic student centers.

The UNM financial aid office estimates that it will have distributed approximately \$12,-

000,000 this year with, once again, at least 45 per cent going to minority students.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we shortly approach the time when the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1978 will be considered, it would be wise to reflect on one area where Congress and the President have differing opinions and legislative proposals—that is, in the area of education. The President had originally provided no funds for the national direct student loan program in his fiscal year 1978 budget proposal. This program provides a revolving fund to colleges to offer loans for students. The Carter position was the repayment of earlier student loans from the NDSL program would amount to \$276 million next year. The budget plan rationale noted that other new and expanded Federal loan programs aimed at the underprivileged, would make up for a cutback in NDSL funds. Several colleges and universities, though, objected to the Carter proposal. Some argued that they had not been able to collect student loans which were past due.

As a result of heated and long drawn-out negotiations, the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare added \$379 million to the fiscal year 1978 education appropriations bill for the national direct student loan program. This action will most surely be sustained by the entire House when this bill is considered on the floor.

As a result of this confusion and inherent weaknesses of the NDSL and other loan programs. I think that the time has come to study new proposals to help assist our families as they attempt to cope with the ever-increasing costs of college education for their children.

I have become very concerned with this problem and have introduced a bill (H.R. 6301) with nearly 30 cosponsors to come to grips with this unsettling situation. As part of our attempt to convince the House of Representatives to consider our proposal, I was pleased to testify before the House Budget Committee about this bill on May 12. I would like to, at this time, include the text of my remarks before the committee in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY HONORABLE TOM CORCORAN

I am pleased to be here today to testify before the first House committee to hold hearings on an idea which has been neglected for too long.

The idea of tax credits for post-secondary education is not a new one. Twice, during 1976, the Senate passed such legislation. This House, for what reasons I do not know, has rejected this legislation.

Similar legislation has been introduced again this year, and I have come to join Senator Roth in urging you to look with favor on our proposal.

The costs of a college education are rising at a terrifying rate, while we struggle just to

keep our heads above water with paychecks that always seem just a little too short.

Consider, for a moment, these facts, supplied to me by the House Education and Labor Committee. The cost of one year in a public college will be four percent higher in the 1977-78 school year than it is in the 1976-77 school year. At private schools, the increase will be 5.2 percent. This is not an isolated instance. The trend of higher and higher college costs is persistent.

In the years between 1970 and 1977 the cost of tuition alone increased 57.2 percent at public colleges! Fifty-seven percent, and there's no end in sight. If you have an 18-year-old child, one who plans on entering college next year, it will cost you, on the average, \$17,500 for four years at a public university. If, on the other hand, your child is in the first grade this year, you can plan on spending \$35,420 for his bachelor's degree. Finally, if your child is born this year, college costs will be \$47,330 for four years when the child enters college.

To meet this expense, you would have to save \$1,570 every year. In addition, if you want your child to attend a private college, and about one-fourth of our college students do go to private institutions, the cost for a baby today will be \$82,830 by the time he or she reaches college age.

So far, I've talked about four-year colleges and universities. What about those students who prefer a two-year school—either a junior college or a vocational school? The increase in cost at two-year schools has risen over one hundred and thirty percent since 1970. It now costs nearly as much to attend a two-year school as it did to attend a four-year school not that long ago.

During the past two years, state support for education, on a per student basis, and adjusted for inflation, has declined in about half of the states. This creates still another pressure toward increased costs for post-secondary education.

The result of this increase in the cost of post-secondary education is quite simple, and equally frightening. Many able and eager young students are being priced out of school. They are being denied what most Americans have always considered a basic right—the right to better themselves through education.

I am aware of the studies which show that, today, a college degree does not mean a person will automatically get a better job, or that he will be better paid. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, we all too often equate a better job or higher pay with a better person. I believe that we, in the United States, are guilty of perverting the idea of what a college education, or indeed any education, is. Education, especially at the post-secondary level, should not be merely a training program for some job. Education should be nourishment for the mind and heart; it should contribute to the creation of a thoughtful, well-rounded person—one who is equipped to apply his God-given talents and abilities to the problems of everyday life; problems which are becoming increasingly complex.

So, Mr. Chairman, because education is so important, I am worried. I am worried by the increasing numbers of young people in all income brackets who are no longer going to college. I am most concerned, though, with figures which show the biggest decline attending college is in the middle-income range; that is, from families whose income is between \$10,000 and \$15,000 per year. During the 1974-75 school year, there was a drop of nearly seven percent in students entering college from middle-income families as compared with the 1972-73 school year.

These figures make it clear, at least to me, that something needs to be done. It is equally clear that the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, the National Direct Student

Loan Program and other loan programs like them are not the complete solution. Both of these programs are costly to administer, and both have very high default rates. For example, four years ago, Congress appropriated \$40 million to cover defaults on these loans. This past year, five times as much money—200 million dollars—has been appropriated for defaults. In addition, President Carter has proposed elimination of the NDSL Program, which is one of the largest of the student loan programs, in his fiscal 1978 budget.

I think the legislation Senator Roth and I have introduced—an income tax credit for post-secondary education expenses—can be a viable replacement.

This legislation provides a meaningful incentive for parents to continue the education of their children beyond elementary and secondary levels. Known as "The College Tuition Tax Relief Act of 1977", this bill would provide tax credits for college education expenses paid by an individual for himself, his spouse, or his dependents. The amount of tax credit is an incremental progression: \$250 in 1977; \$300 in 1978; \$400 in 1979; and \$500 in 1980 and thereafter.

These credits would apply to tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment required for courses of instruction of eligible institutions. Only full-time students are eligible for this credit who are above the secondary education level and attend an institution of higher education (including community colleges) or a vocational school.

Such a tax credit would have three advantages. First, and foremost, it is aid directly to those who bear the brunt of college costs, especially the middle class, which has financed most student aid programs while being denied the benefits of those programs. Every student, or the parent of a student who is not self-supporting, can take advantage of the credit. It is a form of aid with few strings attached.

Secondly, the tax credit is simple and inexpensive from an administrative point of view.

Finally, the cost of the program, in terms of revenue loss, would not be prohibitive. The revenue ceiling in the Fiscal '77 budget is \$348.5 billion. According to the figures I've been given by the Joint Committee on Taxation, the revenue loss from a tuition tax credit, if it became effective on June 30, 1977, would only be \$138 million, or less than three one-hundredths of one percent of total revenues. In Fiscal 1978, when the credit would be increased from \$250 to \$300, and when the proposed revenue ceiling will be \$396.3 billion the revenue loss would be \$988 million—still only about one-quarter of one percent.

In the Federal budget for 1977, only 2 percent was spent on education. If we consider the revenue loss from a tuition tax credit as an expenditure, we will still be spending less than 3 percent of our budget for higher education. Is such an expenditure out of line when we in Congress spend more than that on our own operations? In a world which grows more intricate with each passing day, we must educate as many of our young people as we can; educate them not only in terms of vocational skills, but in terms of knowledge itself.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we must school our young people in the way to learn. We must instill in them the thirst for information, the desire to seek out all the mystery that life has to offer and to use it for their own betterment.

It is for that reason that I urge this committee to support this legislation.

Thank you, and I would be happy to entertain any questions.

CITIZEN COMMENT ON THE CLAM-SHELL ANTI-NUCLEAR LUDDITIES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Clamshell Alliance's antinuclear power organizers, veterans of the pro-Vietcong demonstrations of the 1960's, have misjudged the effect of their mass lawbreaking adventure on May Day. They have gained their support from the fringes of the ecology movement, from the Marxist New Left, and from naive students; but they have alienated themselves from the mainstream of citizens.

The Clamshell Alliance and its subsidiaries rely for funds on a tax-exempt foundation, the Haymarket People's Fund, which only provides money to groups it determines are organizing in support of eventual Marxist revolution. The Haymarket money is provided by radical heirs to free enterprise fortunes, the dilettantes of dissent, who take a tax exemption for donations to groups conspiring to break the law.

The perceptive citizens of New England, however, have not been taken in by radical protests. I was delighted to read a letter to the editor of the Manchester Union Leader by Mrs. Louise G. Muzzey, a Massachusetts resident, which shows a clear understanding of the issues, and the steps necessary to remedy the problem. The letter follows:

[From the Manchester (H.N.) Union Leader, May 18, 1977]

TIME, MONEY TO THROW AWAY

Addressed to William Loeb: It is very interesting to read letters in the MUL from around this nation from individuals wondering where the malcontents get their money to survive.

The young people in the age bracket from 20 to 35 who have inherited wealth and have liberal thinking can only support those groups that are considered progressive and for social change. They have too much time and money to throw away.

Those nuke-haters at Seabrook are a good example. They either are supported by inherited wealth or by the taxpayers. If they had legal jobs and other responsibilities, they would have no time for protesting.

Although I live in the Bay State, I hope no disaster comes up in this state because we deserve no help from the other New England states seeing our Governor refused help to New Hampshire because of Seabrook. For one who wants regional government, he was quick to say no when the need arose for help.

It is not surprising to know that nearly half of the protestors at Seabrook were from the Hot-Bed of Radicalism on the East Coast (Massachusetts).

People should become aware of reading material other than local papers because data turns up in out-of-town material that sometimes proves very interesting.

It is about time the American public woke up and started complaining to Congress about the fact that the people of the United States of America have no protection for the internal security of this country. No individual has any rights today unless they are left-of-center but I would rather be Right.

In closing, Seabrook is a good example of the future of New England unless the public stands up and supports those in favor of our Republic.

Mrs. LOUISE G. MUZZEY.

SOMERVILLE, MASS.

INSTANT VOTERS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the following, which appeared in the May 21 Washington Post, offers some interesting points on H.R. 5400, the Universal Voter Registration Act:

INSTANT VOTERS

It is not clear whom President Carter had in mind when he told the United Auto Workers the other day that "some powerful special interests are trying to kill the electoral reform bill, because they don't want working people to register and to vote." That formulation may serve the President's interest—and perhaps his party's—in bringing about instant, election-day voter registration. But one need not be a "special interest" in order to see grave defects in the bill. To sum up our own view in Mr. Carter's terms, we do want working people and others to register and vote—but not necessarily on the same day.

The bill's wrongheadedness starts with its premise that pre-registration is a major barrier to voting. That used to be true. But registration rules and procedures have been greatly eased since 1960—and the percentage of voting-age Americans who turn out in presidential elections has been dropping anyway. The primary causes of the decline are demographic changes, public disenchantment and apathy—forces that can't be countered by a law. While simplifying pre-registration—by using a postcard system, for example—is a good idea in itself, it does not necessarily lead to larger turnouts at the polls. Even abolishing pre-registration may affect the turnout less than the nature of a given campaign. Last November, turnouts were a few percentage points above 1972 levels in the four states with instant registration. But they were also higher in most Southern states, where pre-registration is still required.

It's generally assumed that larger turnouts would help the Democrats, which is why partisan lines are drawn so sharply on this bill. The basic question, though, is whether democracy as well as Democrats would be well served by making election-day registration available in every precinct in the land. An impressive array of state and local election officials, among others, say no. They predict widespread fraud if they can no longer obtain signature cards and verify addresses of all potential voters before election day. Requiring voters to show IDs and sign an affidavit at the polling place may deter fraud in Minnesota and other states where elections are generally scandal-free. In areas with more turbulent traditions, though, stronger precautions have proven desirable—as Rhode Island's secretary of state said in Senate testimony excerpted For the Record on this page.

The administration's bill presents other problems, too. It would compel most states to rewrite their election laws in short order, and to train many new precinct workers to process instant registrations. It would trample on the tradition of state governance of state and local elections. States would have to

either extend instant registration across the board or suffer the cost and confusion of running elections under two different sets of rules. Finally, the federal grants for administration and "voter outreach" strike us as virtually impossible to police without bureaucratic controls so elaborate that the states will rebel and the Federal Election Commission will collapse.

All in all, the more we study this proposal, the worse it looks. We have no quarrel with instant registration, or no registration, where the integrity of elections is not jeopardized thereby. But the states ought to make that judgment for themselves. We see no current abuses so flagrant, and no potential benefits so great, as to justify the dangers this program would open up and the disruption it would cause. If the Democrats want to get more voters to the polls, they could try to do so in the time-honored way: through good political organization, a sound choice of issues, strong candidates and vigorous campaigns.

URGES SUPPORT FOR DINGELL-BROYHILL AMENDMENT

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate my support for the amendment being offered to the House by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL).

I am most interested in the solutions proposed by the amendment and the committee bill to eliminate the anti-competitive and anticonsumer aspects of the performance warranty of the Clean Air Act. My first observation is that both the committee bill and Dingell-Broyhill amendment recognize that the performance warranty is anticompetitive, so there appears to be agreement on that point. After careful consideration of both measures, it is obvious to me that enough study has taken place on the issue. The committee bill reduces the warranty for only 3 years and mandates yet another study. This is not an effective solution. The committee bill would force Congress to act in 3 years to keep the warranty from automatically reverting to 5 years, 50,000 miles. This, Congress is not likely to find the time to do. Enough study has taken place on the issue, all 19 members of the House Small Business Committee recommended that the warranty be reduced because of its anticompetitive and anticonsumer aspects and the recent statement of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department indicates that the warranty would create enormous costs to the consumer and have a major anticompetitive impact.

I would urge my colleagues to support the Dingell-Broyhill amendment which corrects the anticompetitive and anticonsumer aspects of the performance warranty permanently and has the support of 102 aftermarket associations representing over 166,000 business member firms. The Members of the House should remember that the committee bill submitted to the House and approved by the House last year carried a permanent

reduction to 18 months and 18,000 miles, similar to the Dingell-Broyhill provision. Unless this problem is permanently solved now, the independent garage and aftermarket industry would not be able to survive what the Small Business Committee indicated the performance warranty would do without relief—that is mandate a monopoly for parts and services by the Big Four.

Again, I would urge my fellow Members to support the Dingell-Broyhill amendment as the only permanent solution to the problems inherent in the performance warranty of the Clean Air Act.

FORGOTTEN VETERANS OF VIETNAM

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I insert into the RECORD an article from the May 25 Washington Post by Jan Craig Scruggs. As many of you know, I am a Vietnam veteran and this article eloquently adds to many of the comments I have been making over the past few years about the treatment of Vietnam veterans:

FORGOTTEN VETERANS OF THAT PECULIAR WAR (By Jan Craig Scruggs)

Just as the Vietnam war was unique in the way that it was waged—and lost—so that conflict has subjected our youngest-ever crop of war veterans to pressures unparalleled in American military history. The victory parades and hero status awarded to previous generations of military returnees were simply not present. The national turmoil surrounding the war made one's status as a Vietnam veteran a dubious distinction at best.

Probably no aspect of the war has been more exploited, misunderstood and officially neglected than the readjustment problems of Vietnam returnees. In the past two years the psychological and academic communities have finally started taking an interest in the effects of having participated in that conflict. We are seeing research indicating that serious and prolonged adjustment problems exist for many Vietnam veterans.

My personal interest in this topic is rooted in my own experience. When I was a naive teenager, a profound sense of duty compelled me to serve my country during time of war. After my tour, the wounds and medals I received as an infantryman in Vietnam became slowly transformed into reminders of my part in a cruel and meaningless conflict. My naive acceptance of America as a great and noble land gave way to more critical thinking as my conventional beliefs, attitudes and values were shaken by the war. I sometimes felt a deep bitterness toward this country as I reflected back to a quiet Sunday in 1970, when two very special friends of mine, a young black and a Jewish draftee, suddenly lay dismembered and motionless in the dirt of Vietnam.

During graduate training in counseling psychology at American University, I initiated a long and expensive social psychological investigation of the war's effects upon college veterans. A questionnaire was designed to test the major hypotheses advanced by the scant literature available on this

neglected topic. A prominent psychology professor, Dr. Allan Berman, provided excellent professional guidance. Questionnaires were given to 600 Vietnam veterans at local universities. Our 233 replies yielded some important findings about the psychological aftermath of that peculiar war.

The research found that men who served in units with a casualty rate of more than 25 per cent were statistically higher in political alienation. These veterans were also 11 times more likely to report dreaming of Vietnam combat than those who served in units with no casualties. Many evidenced low self-esteem. Only half of the sample did not feel that Vietnam duty had caused them psychological problems. Only one of the black combat veterans did not feel that Vietnam duty had hurt him psychologically. Some veterans who had psychological problems from the war indicated a reluctance to seek help from the Veterans Administration. Combat veterans had a 30 per cent rate of separations and divorce. The dry statistics of the social sciences revealed a sad legacy remaining from a war that this country is trying to forget.

In my present futile search for federal employment. I recently spoke with a civil-service counselor who has talked with several young men who refuse their five-point preferences rather than bear the stigma of being known as Vietnam veterans. One of the biggest and longest running jokes in this town is the special 10-point preference for disabled Vietnam veterans. Ronald Drach, employment director for the Disabled American Veterans and himself an amputee from Vietnam combat, states that it is generally not enforced and that cases exist where it has been intentionally circumvented by federal agencies. Most of the federal employees who have tried to help me and other disabled Vietnam veterans gain employment are also frustrated about this situation. The Department of Labor, which has been given the task of enforcing affirmative-action programs for hiring Vietnam-era veterans, sets a miserable example for private industry. Vietnam-era veterans constitute less than 1 per cent of the department's total work force, one of the lowest for any major federal agency. March unemployment statistics revealed that the unemployment rate for the youngest age group of Vietnam-era veterans has increased one percentage point, to 17.2 per cent. However, the unemployment rate for the same age group of male non-veterans has decreased one point to 10.4 per cent.

My findings are really not surprising. Several years back some leading psychiatrists, including Dr. Peter Bourne and Yale's Dr. Robert J. Lifton, warned that the Vietnam conflict would have serious, delayed consequences for many who served there. The very nature of this odd war—the lack of psychological justification for the soldier engaged in it, and society's indifference upon his return—perhaps made this inevitable.

It is, of course, not recent news that war has adverse effects on the human psyche. We have always known that. What is new, however, is that this country has never before given veterans the shoddy treatment that has been bestowed upon those who served in Vietnam. Many who volunteered or allowed themselves to be drafted did so with vague assurances of future educational benefits and employment. They returned to find that the GI Bill was inadequate and that many jobs were filled by those who had purposely avoided their military obligation.

The new administration has taken some measures to provide assistance, however belatedly, to those who became the victims of this nation's foreign-policy mistakes. It is not yet clear how far President Carter is willing to go to alleviate the appalling unemployment rate for veterans. He has, however, demonstrated his wisdom in the appointment of an energetic Vietnam returnee, Max Cleland,

as the new chief of the Veterans Administration. Some healthy changes are now taking place to make the VA's services more in keeping with the needs of all veterans. Cleland wants to reverse his agency's poor retention rate for physicians. He wants to expand the drug- and alcohol-treatment facilities. Furthermore, he recognizes the need for the Veterans Administration to provide readjustment counseling, the lack of which has exacerbated the problems of many Vietnam veterans.

My research will soon be reviewed by the Senate and House committees on veterans' affairs. If nothing comes of that, the effort will be buried away in some academic journal. But my findings, as well as those of other researchers, highlight some very real problems that will not go away, for all the haste with which this country may seek to sweep a shameful war under the rug.

There is a major issue here for this country to resolve, for the indifference and lack of compassion that the veterans have received is, to a large degree, a reflection of our lack of a national reconciliation after Vietnam. The fundamental challenge should now be to meet the very real needs of this group as a major step toward America's final recovery from that war. The power—and the responsibility—to make good on the national obligation to Vietnam-era veterans ultimately rests with the President and the Congress. No efforts can provide compensation, of course, to the Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice in Vietnam. For them, perhaps, a national monument is in order to remind an ungrateful nation of what it has done to its sons.

PHILADELPHIA'S MEMORIAL DAY CEREMONIES TO BE HELD ABOARD HISTORIC NAVY VESSEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce that Philadelphia's official Memorial Day ceremonies will be held aboard the U.S.S. *Olympia*, Monday, May 30, at Penn's Landing.

The special memorial services are being sponsored by the Cruiser Olympia Association in conjunction with the city's 30-member United Veterans Council.

Speakers include Adm. Wycliffe D. Toole, Jr., commandant of the Fourth Naval District, and Fire Commissioner Joseph R. Rizzo.

Admiral Toole and Commissioner Rizzo will receive special citations from the Cruiser Olympia Association in recognition of their efforts in helping to preserve the historic ship which served as Adm. George E. Dewey's flagship during the battle of Manila Bay in May 1898.

Floral wreaths will be tossed onto the waters of the Delaware in memory of the Nation's war dead. Taps will be sounded by members of the Police and Firemen's Band and volleys will be fired by a U.S. Marine Corps squad.

Entertainment will be provided by the Police and Firemen's Band, the Artisans Memorial American Legion Band, and the Former Big Band All Stars.

Many other Memorial Day ceremonies will be held throughout the city over the weekend as Philadelphians join with

Americans all across the country in honoring those who served in the armed forces.

A HOUSING PROGRAM TO AID YOUNG FAMILIES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of Americans today cannot afford to purchase their own homes because of the rapid rise in housing prices which we have experienced during the last few years. We are reaching the point where the American dream of owning your own home is a luxury for the fortunate few and beyond the reach of the vast majority of Americans.

INFLATIONARY STRAIN

While inflation over the past 7 years has placed strains on all segments of our economy, it has been especially severe on the housing sector. Since 1970 the relative cost of homeownership has risen at an annual rate of 8.3 percent compared to an overall increase in the Consumer Price Index of 7.7 percent. Sale price of a new home has risen at an annual rate of 9.4 percent while an existing home has risen at a rate of 10.7 percent.

For the first time in history, the average new American home costs \$51,600—38 percent more than the price just 3 years ago.

As housing prices have continued to escalate, the proportion of American families able to afford a median-priced new home has declined from 54.7 percent in 1970 to 39.6 percent in 1975—after income tax considerations. During the same time, we have also witnessed a decline in the proportion of families able to afford existing homes. Recent studies indicate that only about one-fourth of all U.S. families could afford to buy the average new home at today's prices.

While the statistics confirm the damage already done to the housing market, the outlook for the future is even more discouraging. If we assume a 7-percent inflation rate in the overall economy, it is estimated that by 1986 the median-priced new home will sell for close to \$90,000 with the average downpayment required averaging close to \$23,000.

There are several recognizable factors which have contributed to this steady rise in prices: Rapidly rising sales prices, rising mortgage interest rates, and rising utility and maintenance costs.

The effect is devastating.

If present trends continue, more and more Americans will simply not be able to afford their own home. Young families seeking to purchase their first home will be hit hardest.

The first-time home buyer is confronted with the full impact of cost increases, and he lacks the necessary resources to meet those increases. A study prepared by the Congressional Budget Office shows that the cost of a median-priced new home for first-time home

buyers has on average risen one and a half times as fast as their incomes in the period of 1970-75.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, legislative efforts are necessary to keep homeownership within the reach of most Americans. During my study of legislative remedies, I became most interested in the proposals being advanced by Senator Brooke of Massachusetts. I am pleased to introduce in the House of Representatives a two-part bill which embodies these proposals. I believe adoption of this bill will make the dream of a decent home possible for millions of Americans who cannot afford to purchase a home.

GRADUATED PAYMENT MORTGAGE

The graduated payment mortgage concept is designed to attack one of the major defects of the present standard fixed-payment mortgage, which bases the amount of house a family can afford on its income at the time the house is purchased—even though they may live in the house for many years and their income can be expected to increase during that time.

The idea is to structure the mortgage payment so that it rises over time rather than remaining fixed for the life of the loan.

In effect, the graduated payment mortgage simply tilts the mortgage payment stream so that it more closely corresponds to a typical family's income growth over a period of years. In the early years of the loan, a family or individual would pay lower monthly mortgage payments with payments increasing over the duration of the loan.

The primary advantage is that it enables most families to purchase a home that they would not have been able to afford with a standard level payment mortgage—provided that they have good reason to expect their income to grow in the future. Thus, the graduated payment mortgage is particularly suited to young families buying their first home.

The concept of the graduated payment mortgage is not new. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has initiated an experimental program, and the bill I propose would extend that experiment to better reflect market realities. Essentially, I propose allowing the Federal Housing Administration to insure graduated payment mortgages under certain specified conditions.

The best way to experiment with this concept is to remove all volume restrictions and let potential home buyers choose between a conventional mortgage and readily available graduated payment mortgages.

INDIVIDUAL HOUSING ACCOUNT

The second part of my bill is designed to help the potential first-time home buyer meet the substantial downpayment necessary for purchase of a home. It is estimated that at the present time a young household needs between \$10,000 to \$12,000 to purchase a home. By 1986, if present trends continue, between \$20,000 to \$23,000 could be required.

Accumulation of the downpayment can be prohibitive, particularly when an individual or family is just starting out.

The best way to assist these individuals is to offer an incentive for them to save enough money to pay the downpayment.

I, therefore, propose creation of an individual housing account—IHA—a tax-exempt savings account.

This savings account would permit a potential home buyer to deposit up to \$2,500 a year to a maximum of \$10,000. This amount would be deductible from income for tax purposes, and the interest income would be exempt from taxation. At any point, this money could be withdrawn and used toward the purchase of a home. As long as the IHA was applied toward the purchase of a home, no tax would have to be paid on this sum or the interest income which has accrued in this account. These special IHA accounts would be restricted to first-time home buyers—a group which does not have the advantage of equity accumulation in an existing home.

This particular proposal includes a provision to recapture a portion of the lost taxes. At the time of resale, a homeowner would subtract from the original purchase price of the house that portion of the downpayment which was derived from the individual housing account.

Since the program would be restricted to first-time home buyers, it would benefit young and low- and moderate-income households. It provides a positive incentive for frugality without resembling a giveaway program.

STAKE IN SOCIETY

Mr. Speaker, homeownership has traditionally been a way in which American families build a stake in our society. If, for reasons largely beyond their control, families are denied the opportunity of owning their own home, we will have lost one of the most important stabilizing forces in our society. That would be frustrating for the individual and damaging to society as a whole.

I do not want to see this happen, and that is why I am pleased to endorse the concepts contained in this proposal. I commend this legislation to the attention of my colleagues.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had to miss the recorded vote on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for consideration of H.R. 6161, the Clean Air Act amendments.

At the time when the vote was taken, I was meeting with EDA officials concerning the implementation of the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976. Because of procedural errors in last year's program and a number of questions which have been raised by Dade County, I wanted to be sure that no mistakes would be made this time and that all communities in my district had a clear understanding of the guidelines.

I believe my time was well spent in this endeavor. Had I been present on the floor of the House when the vote was taken, I would have voted "yea."

UNNECESSARY HYSTERECTOMIES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, in our country which boasts medical technology second to none, American women should not receive medical care that is second best. According to recent hearings on unnecessary surgery held by the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, some estimate that up to 40 percent of the hysterectomies performed each year in the United States are not medically required.

Unnecessary hysterectomies subject women to all the risks of major surgery, as well as postoperation depression and physical complications. One out of every 10 fatalities in surgery is due to anesthetic. Commonsense tells us surgery should never be performed where it is not clinically indicated.

These unnecessary operations are big business for unscrupulous surgeons. In 1975, more wombs were removed than tonsils—725,000. This is an increase of 25 percent since 1970. By age 65, half of all American women will have had a hysterectomy. Many of these women are subjected to the risk of cancer from hormone replacement therapy following surgery.

Rarely have I felt as dismayed at a hearing as I did when listening to the testimony of Dr. James Sammons, executive vice president of the American Medical Association, before the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. Dr. Sammons not only defended but actually advocated hysterectomy to relieve women's anxiety about pregnancy or cancer—even where there were no clinical signs that surgery was warranted.

I would expect great care and restraint to be exercised in ordering this serious surgical procedure. Instead, at the hearings I heard a callous litany of reasons why the United States has the highest number of hysterectomies per capita of any industrial nation. The hysterectomy rate in the United States is 2½ times that of England, and 4 times that in Sweden.

Most disturbing of all is the finding of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee that the rate of hysterectomies is higher when surgeons are paid on a fee for service rather than a salaried basis. Are surgical operations to be determined by the profit motive rather than sound medical judgment? This strikes at the very core of medical ethics, and casts a long shadow over one of our most learned and esteemed professions.

I would like to close my remarks by including in the Record a recent article by one of America's most discerning

columnists, Ellen Goodman. I include her article on the surgery hearings, because it capsulizes so well the indignation we all should feel at the casual escalation of unnecessary surgery on American women:

U.S. WOMEN ARE HAVING TOO MANY HYSTERECTOMIES (By Ellen Goodman)

BOSTON.—The man from the American Medical Association was pretty direct about it. If a woman had hysteria, then the cure might well be a hysterectomy.

Yes, there was something positively Grecian about the dogged line of reasoning pursued by Dr. James Sammons as he testified before the House Commerce oversight subcommittee that has been investigating unnecessary surgery.

The word "hyster" began its unfortunate etymological history as Greek for "uterus." It doesn't take a National Organization for Women task force to trace its descent into the English word "hysteria"—"an uncontrollable outburst of emotion or fear."

With that background, it should not have been surprising to find Dr. Sammons telling the congressional hearing that the AMA supported surgery as a means of cutting out fear. He condoned a hysterectomy for women in states of "acute pregnophobia" (fear of pregnancy) and acute cancer phobia.

In the process, he pointed up one thing: Hysterectomies have become big business. In 1975, more wombs were removed than tonsils—725,000 in all, up a full 25 percent from 1970. At this rate, half of all American women over 65 will have had their uteruses taken out.

Of course, relatively few of these operations are done for the fearful, but Dr. Sammons' casual attitude toward the procedure shows up in the statistics. The hysterectomy rate in the United States is 2½ times that of England and 4 times that of Sweden.

Of all these procedures, no more than 20 percent are performed for cancer or other life-threatening disorders. A large number, however, are done for sterilization, despite the availability of less drastic and less complicated procedures. At Los Angeles County Hospital for example, 20 percent were done openly for contraception.

That does not count the ones that are done less openly. Dr. Malkah Notman, associate professor at the Harvard Medical School, has noted that "there is a group of Catholic women who are in conflict about contraceptives. They come to the doctor with 'symptoms.' If they are 'sick' and 'need' a hysterectomy, then they are off the hook. Everybody, including the doctor, goes along with it."

Their operations become part of the 15 to 40 percent of all hysterectomies that, by conservative estimate, are "questionable." In the attempt to understand how this happens, some blame "consumer demand," and some blame surgeons for being profit-motivated and/or knife-happy.

Yale Medical School's Dr. John Morris testified that some California surgeons now pay \$100 a day for malpractice insurance; and added: "That can't help but affect some surgeons' judgment." It is known that the rate of operations is higher among the patients of doctors who are paid on a piece-rate (rather than salaried) basis.

Aside from the money incentive, surgeons in general are prone to work by the motto, When in doubt, cut it out. Dr. Notman, who has studied depression in posthysterectomy patients says: "There are too many hysterectomies done because they appeal to the surgeon's sense of tidiness. It is the obvious way to get rid of the symptoms."

This attitude combines with another, says Dr. Notman: "It's pretty clear that most

surgeons think that the uterus is useless once women are done having babies."

A study by a sociologist, Diana Scully, in Illinois found that many surgical residents develop a "sales pitch" for the operation, which she quoted this way: "Think of the uterus as a cradle. After you've had all your babies, there's no reason to keep the cradle."

Surgeons themselves often maintain that women seek, and even shop, for a hysterectomy. Dr. Kenneth Ryan, chairman of Harvard Medical School's obstetrics and gynecology department—who also testified in Washington—does not believe that happens very often. When it does, he says, "we ought to figure out why instead of just going ahead and doing it. In the menopausal years, especially, we need more medical care to avoid the procedure rather than encouraging women to have it."

As for the notion of surgically removing the wombs of the fearful, Dr. Ryan was set against it. "The AMA went out on a limb," he said, "I think their position has become untenable."

Indeed, during his testimony the man on the limb had also condoned removing breasts, bunions and assorted limbs under similar acute "mental" symptoms. By the end of the afternoon he was calling the members of Congress by the title "Doctors." There were those who believed that he sounded a touch hysterical.

TRIBUTE TO ALEX HALEY

HON. BARBARA JORDAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Ms. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, it is highly uncommon to pay tribute to a living memorial. It is not the kind of thing that is taken lightly. However, uncommon this task may be, it is nonetheless, done with a great deal of pride and an abundance of sincerity.

Prior to the publication and eventual television drama of "Roots, the Saga of an American Family," this country was becoming increasingly apathetic toward the problem of racial injustice. It appeared that the revolutionary efforts of the 1960's and early 1970's were about to be diminished. People were justifying their apathy by saying that minorities have made substantial gains in recent years, now it is our turn. "Roots" jolted Americans out of this retrogression and served to raise their consciousness level to a new peak. It was a not so subtle reminder that racial prejudice in this country pervades every facet of our society and remains the underlying force which prevents us from coming together as a nation unified to preserve what the Founding Fathers laid down as the law of the land—equal justice. In the reading of Mr. Haley's book, we had to come to grips with this enigma. We had to face the problem squarely in the eye. It is obvious that we will have to direct all of our future efforts to proving that the founders of America had a certain foresight that we have yet to achieve. "Roots" gives us that added push to pursue this common goal vigorously. I applaud Alex Haley's unselfish and courageous efforts. It is an experience that all Americans can share.

THE PLANNED STRATEGIC COMPUTER SALE TO THE SOVIET UNION BY A U.S. FIRM SHOULD BE STOPPED

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been voiced over the years about the sale by U.S. companies of sophisticated technology—particularly that with a military capability or use—to the Soviet Union.

This is a valid concern, because the Soviet Government will definitely convert to military use any technology at its disposal.

The latest planned U.S. sale of potentially lethal strategic technology to the Soviet Union is the reported plan of Control Data Corp. to sell its \$13 million Cyber 76, the highly sophisticated computer used by our own Armed Forces for navigation and weapons guidance in modern aircraft, submarines, missiles, and other defense systems.

I strongly oppose such a sale, and have joined several colleagues in a letter to President Carter requesting the administration not to approve the necessary license for the sale of the Cyber 76 to the Soviets.

Jack Anderson and Les Whitten wrote an excellent column reporting Control Data's planned sale, which was published yesterday by the Washington Post. I include that column and our letter to the President at this point in the RECORD. [From the Washington Post, May 24, 1977]

A SUPER-COMPUTER FOR THE SOVIETS

(By Jack Anderson and Les Whitten)

Control Data is preparing to sell the Soviets a \$13 million electronic brain, which could be turned against us to track U.S. missiles, planes and submarines. It is also capable of decoding sensitive U.S. intelligence transmissions.

The miracle machine is the Cyber 76, which will soon be on its way to the Soviet Union unless there is a last-minute stop order. It not only will be the largest computer ever delivered behind the Iron Curtain, but it is more than a decade ahead of the Soviets' own computer technology. It operates at least 20 times faster than anything the Soviets produce.

A top-secret, interagency study warns tersely that the Soviets can convert the Cyber 76 to military use. Not only can it be used for tracking and decoding, but it could also improve the production of nuclear warheads multiple-headed missiles, aircraft and other military hardware.

There is no sure safeguard to prevent this, the study declares. An intelligence source put it more bluntly. "For a few bucks," he told us, "we're willing to give the Soviets the means to destroy us. We're becoming our own executioners."

Government officials, citing the strict secrecy, refused to show us a copy of the study. But sources with access to the original draft have told us of its warnings. They fear it may be softened in order to make the computer deal more palatable.

Control Data executives, in repeated meetings with U.S. officials, have insisted that the Cyber 76 will be used by the Soviets strictly

to study the weather. The company kept hammering at Washington to get an export license. Final Commerce Department approval of the deal, according to our sources, was imminent until our inquiries caused some hesitation.

The sale of computers to Russia was pushed originally by ex-Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. Eager to promote détente, he overruled military objections to earlier computer sales. Now that the Soviets have already received lesser computers, they will be enraged if the Cyber 76 is withheld from them, say our sources.

One high official source, talking to us in confidence, related how a mysterious Soviet official showed up in the United States a few years ago. The Central Intelligence Agency immediately spotted him as a man with a purpose. He had come here, the CIA warned, to seek strategic U.S. computers.

The State Department, under Kissinger, persuaded the CIA to soften its warning and to pass off the visitor as merely the house guest of Soviet Ambassador Anatoli F. Dobrynin.

This helped lead to computer sales not only to Russia but also to China and Hungary. In return for these sophisticated computers, according to an International Trade Commission report, the Soviets have offered the U.S. "horses, asses and mules" at favored prices. Russia's famous vodka will also be sold to the United States at a tariff of \$1.25 a gallon, instead of the present \$5.

Frustrated U.S. officials complain that the Soviets are getting the best of the deal. They have gained strategic advances from the computers that have already been delivered, these officials assert. But the Cyber 76 would give them a technological boost that no amount of vodka could justify, they say.

The secret study declares categorically that the wonder machine both could and would be misused by the Kremlin for military purposes. Those officials who favor the sale contend, however, that the Soviets will use the Cyber 76 to increase their participation in a world meteorological network. The result, they say, would be better international weather data, larger crops and fewer unexpected natural disasters.

A spokesman for Control Data assured our reporter John Schuber that the computer can be set up in Moscow in a way to prevent any misuse. Any diversion to military use, he said, could be detected immediately. Then Control Data would pull out its technicians and refuse parts to the Soviets, thus crippling the electronic monster.

But other computer experts told our reporter Tony Capaccio that Control Data's arguments are spurious. One former Control Data executive, referring to the alleged safeguards, said derisively: "That's a joke." Other experts agreed that the Soviets could train their own technicians, and eventually locate parts from other countries.

Footnote: At the Commerce Department, spokesmen confirmed that the secret study disclosed "some problems" relating to safeguards against the misuse of the Cyber 76. But the draft report, said the spokesman wasn't final.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, wish to express our strong opposition to the pending sale to the Soviet Union of Control Data Corporation's "Cyber 76" computer.

The "Cyber 76" can be used for navigation and weapons guidance in modern missiles, aircraft, tanks, high performance satellite-

based surveillance systems, ABM defense systems, and submarines.

The "Cyber 76" is the brain center of the Pentagon, the U.S. Air Force, the National Security Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Energy Research and Development Agency has fifteen "Cyber 76s"—they have been described as the backbone of our nuclear research. Moreover, the Cyber series is also used by the North American Air Defense Command.

Soviet assurances that this computer will be used for peaceful purposes are unreliable at best and there is no practical method of monitoring the uses to which the computer is put.

We believe that the strategic military applications of the "Cyber 76" are such that the sale of this advanced technology is not in the national interest of the United States. Therefore, we urge that the license for the sale of the "Cyber 76" not be approved. We also urge that exacting scrutiny be used in the future when evaluating all future sales of advanced design computers which have military applications.

Respectfully,

ROBERT K. DORNAN.
CLAIR W. BURGNER.
ELDON RUDD.

EXAMPLE OF PERFDY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Santa Maria Times entitled "Example of Perfidy," which comments on Vietnam's determination to subjugate all people it can conquer:

EXAMPLE OF PERFDY

Those who feel it is time for normalization of relations with Vietnam have gotten a lesson in the perfidy of the Communist nation.

After having on several occasions told the U.S. that there are no missing in action (MIA) Americans in Vietnam, that nation has now announced that it will not cooperate with the U.S. in searching for MIAs unless agreement is reached over aid to repair damages from the war.

Once again it has been demonstrated that communism uses the truth as a weapon, and the truth becomes a victim just as much as anyone who believes Vietnam can be dealt with truthfully.

Both Ex-President Nixon and his Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, have stated that Vietnam abrogated the portion of an agreement dealing with aid when it continued its aggression. Thus, what America agreed to give as a condition for its withdrawal, is not to be forthcoming—at least as a provision of that agreement.

Any aid that comes now must be under a program by President Carter and with approval of Congress. We see this as doubtful, in view of Congress' action of last week in turning down aid both for Cuba and Vietnam.

Vietnam has remained communistic and has remained unswerving in its determination of subjugating all whom it can conquer.

For the U.S. to supply aid would be a help toward this goal.

DRIVE TO REPEAL HATCH ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the House's decision to postpone indefinitely consideration of H.R. 10, the Hatch Act bill, it is encouraging to note that this legislation was perceived for what it was—another special interest measure that would not so much give more freedom to workers as it would more power to Federal employee unions. One can only hope that, rather than reconsider this measure, the House will simply let it die a quiet, well-deserved death.

The underlying difficulty with any legislation of this type is that it fails to take into account the fact that working for Government is not the same as working for private industry. For one thing, Government is the only supplier of the services it provides while, by virtue of the antitrust laws, there are alternative suppliers in the private sector. For another thing, Government is by definition, sovereign; through its power to tax and regulate, it exercises control over all individuals and businesses in the private sector. Thus, granting public service employees either the right to bargain collectively or the right to be active political partisans, gives them political leverage that private sector employees, even if they were fully unionized, cannot match.

Carrying this explanation a step further, granting a public sector union the right to bargain collectively when it has a monopoly over the delivery of services puts it in a position of being coequal with Government in the setting of public policy, including tax rates. By contrast, a private sector union on strike does not deal directly with Government, does not impact directly on Government services, and often is not the sole provider of goods or services in the private sector. Furthermore, no company would permit its employees to campaign against it in their spare time, whereas repeal of the Hatch Act, coupled with the civil service protections already written into law, would permit Federal employees to campaign against their employer with impunity.

So, the real winner, if the Hatch Act were to be repealed, would be the unions. They would have life or death power over Government and, as a result, would pressure the Federal Government into settlements they would never be able to get if they were operating in the competitive private sector. Moreover, union members would be able to campaign, without fear of retribution, for those who supported their position, or the tax increases to finance it, or both. In any other circumstance, such a situation would be viewed as an inherent conflict of interest.

There are a number of other points that can and should be raised along these

lines but rather than duplicate the excellent presentation of them done recently by columnist Nicholas Von Hoffman, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Von Hoffman's column, which appeared in the May 19 edition of the Baltimore News American, be inserted in this Record at this time. It is well written, thought-provoking, and in my opinion, worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress:

DRIVE TO REPEAL HATCH ACT

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Under the label of reform, a bill repealing most of the Hatch Act is making its way through Congress and toward the Oval Office where the President has said he'll sign it. Oddly enough, the Hatch Act, which prohibits government employees from taking part in partisan, electoral politics, was considered a reform measure when it was passed in 1939. Its purpose was to prevent a president from using the larger numbers of recently hired government employees as campaign workers.

The Roosevelt Administration was often accused of winning elections via this route, but national administrations weren't set up to run huge battalions of campaign workers at the precinct level; unless the patronage could be turned over to state and local officials it was not very useful for winning elections.

Despite his enemies' accusations, FDR didn't try this use of federal employees so he had no trouble living with the Hatch Act. In actuality, the law was superfluous because the protections and job securities afforded by the civil service robbed politicians of the weapons of coercion to make employees into campaign workers. How can you force a postal clerk to work for Gruntz for President if the clerk knows you can't fire him?

In the years after the passage of the Hatch Act, electoral politics underwent a change. In the language of economics it swung from being labor intensive to capital intensive. The costly armies of precinct workers were replaced by television campaigning, which allows a candidate to reach more people per dollar spent than the knock-on-the-door method. Thus it's questionable these federal employees would have been used by presidential incumbents even if there had been no law.

Nevertheless, the Hatch Act has been accomplishing another unintended good. If the political use of federal employees by presidents was never likely, the use of the same employees by labor unions is a much more real possibility.

Without the right to strike or take part in political campaigns, federal employees are already the highest-paid people in the country. Without a Hatch Act they would have long since extorted the right to strike from Congress and along with it even greater advantages in pay, pensions and other fringe benefits.

That's not mere supposition, as the record of the county and municipal workers' unions attests. When public employees are given the right to strike, as well as the right to engage in partisan political activity, there is delivered into their hands a combination of levers no other group of workers gets. The members of the automobile workers union can strike to enforce their wage demands, but what would the price of cars look like if the union could also participate in the election of the auto manufacturers' board of directors?

In addition, for many years public em-

ployee unions have had to negotiate with a pussy cat management; to wit, public officials who weren't spending their own money when they voted wage increases and productivity decreases.

In the last few years the pussy cats have stiffened somewhat because the rest of organized labor, the part that works in the private sector, has gotten so angry. The repeal of the Hatch Act, however, will make it more difficult to keep government salaries in line with those of the rest of the world.

That may be the least of it. It is already close to impossible to fire a government employee because of the civil service. People on the public payroll are given, by law, greater security and tenure than workers in the private sector can get through collective bargaining.

Now, by repeal of the Hatch Act, civil service employees will get so much more protection, and all coercive power to make them work will have been de facto abolished.

Repeal of the Hatch Act will demolish any good that may come from Jimmy Carter's zero-based budgeting or contemplated departmental reorganizations. It doesn't make any difference if a federal program is good or bad in concept if it is to be administered by a bureaucracy in which all supervisory control over the employees has been extinguished or attenuated to the point that the civil servants can be as abusively arrogant to their nominal bosses as they are already to the various publics they make wait in the endless lines of weary and frustrated people stretching out of every government office in America.

The lowest price that should be exacted for the repeal of the Hatch Act is a repeal of the Civil Service Act. Instead, President Carter will sign the measure proclaiming as he does that this is the political emancipation of the enslaved bureaucrats. But the first time he tries to put this creaking government to some good and efficient use, they'll thank him by shoving their fists down his mouth.

ET TU THUNNUS?

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a group of junior high school students from Greenwich, Conn. who in 1974 first brought to my attention the incidental taking of the porpoise by the tuna fishing industry. These students pleaded for something to be done immediately to save these intelligent and affectionate creatures from death at the hands of the American tuna fishermen. It is truly unfortunate that in the past 3 years the killing of hundreds of thousands of porpoises has been allowed to continue resulting in the depletion of several species, including the Eastern Spinner which is nearing extinction.

It is interesting to note the large scale killing of the porpoise by tuna fishermen did not begin until 1957 when the industry began to catch yellowfin tuna by setting large purse seine nets around both tuna and porpoise. This method replaced the traditional hook and line technique and uses the porpoise as a beacon to locate yellowfin tuna since this fish typically swims under and behind the porpoise. However, it is important to realize

catching "tuna on porpoise" does not necessarily mean that hundreds of thousands of porpoises must die. Through skilled shiphandling known as "backing down" it is possible to sluice living porpoise from the purse seine nets. In addition, the use of fine mesh nets have significantly reduced porpoise mortality. True, such methods require extra time and care on the part of the tuna fishermen, but to do otherwise surely means further depletion and possible extinction of a valuable marine resource and friend to man.

Shortly, the House will consider a possible method to save the porpoise, H.R. 6970. Generally, this legislation as approved by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee does provide some protection for the porpoise. As you know, the legislation establishes a 100 percent observer program for the tuna fleets which will be paid for both by the industry and the Department of Commerce. Placing an observer on every tuna boat is vital if accurate figures on the number of porpoises killed are to be recorded. Moreover, according to testimony before both House and Senate committees, most of the porpoise killing was done by only a few culprit tuna boats. Thus, a total observer program will insure that those fishermen who are taking all steps to save the porpoise will not be unduly penalized by the irresponsible actions by those few who are too careless to do the same.

In addition, H.R. 6970 gives additional incentives for saving the porpoise by penalizing skippers with abnormally high kill rates and charging a \$32 fine for each porpoise killed in excess of the industry's average kill rate per ton. Finally, the bill would place restrictions on the transfer of any tuna vessel to a foreign registry unless the new owner agrees to fish in accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Thus, it provides a way for the United States to extend its environmental protection abroad and, more importantly, does not put American tuna fishermen who comply with such goals at a competitive disadvantage.

However, a serious problem with this legislation is that it provides for a higher 1977 quota of allowable porpoise kills—78,900 instead of 59,050. The latter figure was proposed by the administration and would require a continued reduction or "ratcheting down" of the annual kill quota. To allow a quota as high as 78,900 without providing for any further reduction in subsequent years would certainly spell disaster for those stocks of porpoise which are already badly depleted, such as the eastern spinner. Moreover, it is an especially untenable position for the United States to enact into law as it violates the rules of the International Whaling Commission—IWC—because it allows the taking of a depleted marine mammal species. In view of the strong environmentalist position that the United States has taken in the IWC during the past few years, permitting unratcheted and unpenalized killing of the depleted stocks

would certainly weaken our credibility as a world leader in conservation.

I would hope the House will adopt the amendment proposed by my colleagues Mr. McCLOSKEY and Mr. PRITCHARD which will limit the total incidental mortality and serious injury rates authorized in 1980 to no more than 50 percent of that authorized in 1977 and that subsequent annual reductions shall be set at the discretion of the Secretary.

Allowing H.R. 6970's 78,900 annual kill quota to go into effect without reduction during the next several years will only lead to disaster for the porpoise. And whatever the personal feeling about the plight of these fascinating and amicable creatures, it must certainly be asked—without them, can the tuna themselves survive?

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN F. KENNEDY ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH, MAY 29, 1917

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 29, marks the anniversary of the birth of the late Hon. John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States. I would like to express my admiration for the purposes and accomplishments of his brief administration, and hail him as a leader of the highest quality and the most inspiring nature.

As President, John Kennedy was exceptional in many different ways, so much so, and with so many beneficial results, it is hard to realize his term in office was actually of such limited duration.

As President of the United States, John Kennedy was confronted by international situations calling for a full knowledge of the diplomatic arts with which he was well acquainted from an early age. During the service of his father, Joseph Kennedy, as Ambassador to England, John Kennedy was employed as a member of the American Embassy staff in London in which capacity he witnessed at close range the awesome development of World War II. As President in the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 he would reveal an astonishing capacity for diplomatic negotiation.

In the matter of civil rights, John Kennedy brought to the Presidency a totally new concept, in that he fought all his battles against majority oppression right out in the open where there was no doubt as to what he was doing.

Gone was the old, time-honored policy of secret messages to and secret negotiations with Southern Governors. Now, at long last, the Federal Government was taking an open, defiant, public stand against racial segregation; and when Southern officials sought to circumvent the law, the President brought to bear the full force of Federal authority.

Concerned with the living conditions of

poor and middle-income people in many sections of the country, John Kennedy promoted the Housing Act of 1961 to the benefit of many thousands of Americans, and many hundreds of American communities.

To vary a metaphor, the proof of an American political pudding is in the eating—in the anger engendered among the members of the opposition. Not one of the great American Presidents had gone through his term or terms in office without bring down upon his head the outright curses of the opposition. So it was with Washington, with Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln; so it was with Wilson, both the Roosevelts, and Harry Truman. And so it was for John Kennedy.

Cut down by an assassin and rendered a martyr, he is mainly remembered today in melodramatic terms: The young President, the man who brought a youthful flair to politics, the man who captured the imagination of American youth—and all that is true, of course.

But more than that, he was a brave and bold reformer in a period desperate for reforms long overdue—reforms opposed by important elements in Congress, Business, Labor, the Press, and every other influential force.

In the end, death robbed him of his victories, but he had been a President of principle, who fought for justice—not for glory.

It was an honor, Mr. Speaker, to our country to have experienced the leadership of such a man as John F. Kennedy whose record of accomplishments has placed him high among the heroes of our national purposes and the democratic cause throughout the world.

President Kennedy is a man long to be remembered.

CONGRESSMAN McDONALD'S TESTIMONY ON H.R. 6575

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Health Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee and the Health and Environment Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held 3 days of joint hearings on H.R. 6575, President Carter's Hospital Cost Containment proposal. During these hearings we heard from more than 50 witnesses representing the administration, the hospitals, medical professionals, and consumer groups.

On two previous occasions before the House, I stated the reasons for my opposition to H.R. 6575, citing the many factors behind rising hospital costs and the effects that this legislation will have on the quality of hospital care. However, I do not believe that anyone has made a more succinct case against the enactment of this bill than our own colleague, Congressman LARRY McDONALD. As a physician he is particularly qualified to speak to this issue, and I include the remarks he made before the joint hearings

at this point in order that we may all have the benefit of his sage advice:

THE PRESIDENT'S HOSPITAL COST CONTAINMENT PROPOSAL

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate this opportunity to testify on the President's Hospital Cost Containment Proposal, H.R. 6575.

Before commenting on the President's proposal, I would like to briefly consider the problem it is designed to solve and the causes of that problem.

Medical costs have been rising at an average rate of 9 percent per year since 1965, whereas the general rise in prices has averaged 7 percent per year over the same period. Hence the cost of health care is rising more rapidly than can be accounted for by inflation, and that is the problem. Since hospital costs comprise about 40 percent of all health care expenditures, they are one of the first areas to consider in attempting to deal with the problem. (All statistics are from the 1976 Statistical Abstract, Bureau of the Census, unless otherwise indicated.)

Before we can propose solutions, however, we must identify the causes.

Obviously the major cause of the rise in cost is inflation, which is the result of the deficit spending and credit manipulation policies of the Federal government. Discounting this, we have only a 2 percent per year increase to account for.

Various factors have been suggested causing part of this increase. Construction costs, for example, have risen drastically in recent years. Grady Memorial Hospital was built in Atlanta in 1958 at a cost of \$18,000 per bed; whereas St. Joseph's Hospital is presently being completed in Atlanta at a cost of \$100,000 per bed. New discoveries and advanced technology may also be a factor. Whereas in most areas of the economy technological advances constitute a savings and increase efficiency, in medicine they often expand available services and increase demand.

But whatever role such factors may play, I believe it is negligible in comparison to that of the government. In 1965 government at all levels spent \$9.5 billion on health care, which was 24 percent of the total. By 1975 government spending increased 5 times to \$50 billion, which constituted 42 percent of total spending on health care. Consider how this enormous increase in government spending effects the cost of health care.

Price is determined by demand relative to supply times a constant ($P=D/S \times K$), the constant being the money supply which hasn't been so constant in the past 10 years. If demand increases relative to supply, then the price increases and virtually all of this increase in government spending has gone to increase demand, not supply. Hill-Burton funds, for example, may have increased supply slightly, but their amount is insignificant in comparison to spending under programs such as Medicare and Medicaid. These programs offer medical care to eligible recipients at little or no personal cost, producing a kind of open-ended demand force. Obviously this increases demand relative to supply and forces prices to rise. It is, of course, these types of programs which account for most of the increase in government spending. The fiscal 1978 Budget in Brief estimates that Medicare and Medicaid together will account for 82 percent of fiscal year 1977 federal health outlays.

Another way of looking at the effect of the increase in government health care funding is to consider the effect of an increase in the money supply in our price formula. Obviously price is proportional to the money supply, rising with an increase and falling with a decrease. In the past 10 years we have not only had a vast increase in inflation but an even greater increase in the money spent on health care due to the infusion of government funds.

As further proof of the effect, consider the increase in spending on health care relative to the Gross National Product (GNP). In 1965, 5.9 percent of the GNP went for medical expenses, 4.45 percent private funding and 1.45 percent government funding. But by 1975, health care accounted for 8.2 percent of the GNP, with the government spending 3.46 percent and private sources 4.74 percent. Of the increase in percentage of GNP of 2.3 percent from 1965 to 1975, government spending accounted for 2.01 and private spending for only .29—that is, government spending accounted for 87 percent of the increase.

Hence private spending on health care has remained relatively constant, while government spending has increased enormously. Clearly it is this rapid infusion of government funds which is responsible for increased health care costs.

Now let's turn to the Hospital Cost Containment Proposal. Its most striking feature is that it totally ignores the causes of rising hospital costs—inflation and government health care funding. Instead it addresses itself only to the effects—the rising costs themselves. Frankly, I find this unbelievably naive. Legislatively ordering prices to hold still by limiting hospital income is no solution, unless one considers rising costs as an isolated, causeless phenomenon, which may be stamped out of existence by legislative fiat.

In fact, the rising prices have specific causes and if these are not treated, the problem will not be solved. The prices may be temporarily "contained", but the causes will continue to work and the effects will be disastrous.

Consider the results of H.R. 6575. If hospital costs don't rise above the 9% ceiling, then there is no reason for the bill. But if prices do rise to the ceiling, then hospitals will be forced to cut costs. There is only so much room for increased efficiency; sooner or later something in terms of health care service will have to go.

Probably the first to go will be medical innovations and new technology. We will not hear of these new life-saving techniques, they simply won't come into existence. We may never know if or how many lives might have been saved if hospitals would have been allowed to adopt the new medical advances.

Possibly next to go will be hospital expansion. It will surely be too expensive, and besides there will be innumerable layers of government bureaucracy to wade through to get permission to expand.

And as the costs keep bumping the income ceiling, something else must be cut. Hence hospitals find themselves unable to hire new nurses, and quality of health care declines proportionally.

Demand, however, increases incessantly. The population continues to expand and government health programs direct people in ever-increasing numbers through the hospital doors. But by now the supply cannot keep pace, shortages develop and lines begin to form at these same hospital doors. After the initial limitation of new technology in an effort to hold costs, the next step will mean rationing of hospital services in some form and under some label.

Clearly something must be done to insure equal treatment and separate the malingers and neurotics from the authentically sick. So the government expands the Professional Standards Review Organizations' authority to cover everyone, and the government is soon deciding who may be treated and who may not, who may have a needed operation this year, and who must wait for next year, and the next and the next. This in effect is rationing as in England today but always presented under some more palatable term.

There will, of course, be a side door for a new elite—those with political pull. But the vast majority of decent, honest, hard-working citizens will be unable to plan their lives

and make provisions for health emergencies. Even if they work overtime, setting aside extra money to pay for the operation of a loved one, well, that's sure unfortunate. But they'll have to wait in line like anyone else.

Now this scenario may sound grim and there is no way to know how soon it will happen. Nevertheless, it is the inevitable result if we attempt to control costs while continuing to inflate the currency and pour funds into government health programs.

H.R. 6575 would more accurately be titled the Government Mandated Lower Quality Health Care Act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee not to pass any legislation to place cost ceilings on hospital services. It is not hospital income that should be controlled, but government spending. However, even if government spending is not controlled, it is better to allow prices to rise because at least people will be able to plan their future and control their access to health care. The government has no right to mandate lower quality health care and restrict its availability in order to hold down its cost.

Instead, I would hope the respective committees will investigate the actual causes of these cost increases and design legislation to correct the root of the problem. If this requires controlling government spending, then let's get on with it. And if controlling government spending is politically unpalatable, consider the alternative.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, there are countless substantial reasons for opposition to the so-called Agency for Consumer Protection. But, an excerpt from a recent editorial in the Muskegon Chronicle, Muskegon, Mich., may have summed it up best:

We'll never do anything about big government and excessive regulation by adding "another layer or bureaucracy" that will harass business, slow down government machinery and aggravate inflation.

Perhaps another weakness of the entire concept is the fact that there has been such difficulty in naming it. When first proposed, it was to be called the Consumer Protection Agency. Then later it was named the Agency for Consumer Advocacy. But, now we are talking about the Agency for Consumer Protection. So, we might ask what's in a name? In this instance, nothing. We really do not need a name any more than we need more bureaucracy. What we really need is protection from the Consumer Protection Agency, the Agency for Consumer Advocacy, or the Agency for Consumer Protection—whatever its name.

I am pleased to insert an excellent editorial from the April 27, 1977, edition of the Muskegon Chronicle at this time:

PLEASE, NOT ANOTHER BUREAUCRACY!

We noted in these columns during the 1976 presidential campaign that then-candidate Carter had managed adroitly, and often, to get on both sides of an issue.

An arresting example of this talent—if that is the word—was his appearance on both sides of the "cut-the-bureaucracy" fence.

He assured voters that if elected he would reduce the burgeoning federal bureaucracy and reform the powerful, inefficient and costly regulatory system.

He would do that, and at the same time press for enactment of a bill—already several times defeated—that would create a new, superpowerful, independent Agency for Consumer Protection (ACP).

It is a very bad bill, essentially the same as when first introduced back in 1970. It would further bloat the bureaucracy and, through the ACP's authority to intervene in the proceedings of other regulatory agencies, give it the power in court to challenge, disrupt, delay and overturn the decisions of virtually all other government rule-making bodies.

In addition to these powers, the ACP also would have information-gathering authority that would permit it to demand business records to a degree that would turn officials of the government's 33 regulatory agencies—even OSHA bureaucrats—green with envy.

The last thing business needs is another paper-work deluge. Labor wants no part of the bill—it managed to get itself exempted—and, Ralph Nader to the contrary, it is decidedly not needed by the tax-battered American consumer.

The ACP bill in 1975 won Senate approval and, considering the infusion of newly elected liberal, consumer-oriented members, was expected to sail easily through the House.

But 1975 was a year of growing public disenchantment with the federal bureaucracy, and by the time the bill reached the House floor—where it was fought vigorously by Rep. Guy M. Vander Jagt, R-Luther—it slithered through with a slim nine-vote margin.

Then-Senate Minority Leader Robert P. Griffin, R-Mich., had urged President Ford to veto the measure (a virtual certainty) and, since the margin of adoption was far short of the number of votes needed to override, it was allowed to die.

But it didn't stay dead.

Unhappily for all of us it was resurrected after Carter pledged support, and unless the public again voices strong opposition the result this year could be different.

The bill is objectionable on many scores, and particularly in its assumption that it would speak for all consumers. All Americans are consumers, granted. But as opponents point out, consumers have a vast variety of wants, needs, interests, tastes, life-styles and buying habits.

These interests often conflict, and it is an arrogant absurdity to assert there is a "consumer interest" which can be represented by a single agency.

There are all kinds of consumer groups, each with its own platform and lobbying organization, and the most effective of these, speaking in their own specific interests, would find in an ACP super-bureaucracy a club ready-made to inflict their minority views on the majority.

As noted, the ACP would have almost unlimited powers to interfere in the affairs of other agencies by arranging to fight and to appeal decisions in the courts.

It is estimated it will cost at least \$60 million to set up and run the ACP for three years, and it's a safe bet that that's a conservative guess.

It doesn't take into consideration the costs of other agencies forced to respond to ACP interference, nor the costs to business and consumers of regulations promulgated by the new agency.

As a matter of fact, the 1975 ACP bill carried a price tag of only \$10 million for the first year. This time around it's pegged at \$15 million—which will scarcely surprise taxpayers who know the financial feeding habits of federal bureaucracies.

The consumer does need to be protected. And heaven knows there exist plenty of laws and agencies designed to do this. Plainly, they don't do this well. Thoroughgoing reform is badly needed. But not this way.

Not by making "big government" bigger still.

Much the better course is that recommended—and started—by the Ford Administration. President Ford wanted measures taken to safeguard consumer interests within the agencies themselves, directing them to review their procedures to be sure these interests were being adequately heard and represented.

He also called on the heads of the major regulatory agencies to evaluate the costs and benefits of proposed regulations. The heads of the major independent regulatory agencies were ordered in to discuss the need for changes, and a similar session on regulatory reform was held with congressional leaders.

These efforts and initiatives would be scrapped if APC is created as an all-inclusive agency.

We think most of our readers will agree with President Ford's response to the last Naderite effort to "protect" us all into the poor house. He said:

"I do not believe that we need yet another federal bureaucracy in Washington, with its attendant costs ... and hundreds of employees."

It is gratifying that Sen. Griffin and Rep. Vander Jagt are ready, again, to fight the bill. And Sen. Donald M. Riegle, the Flint Democrat, should.

If you are concerned, readers—and we hope you are—you can help the cause by writing to them, and to President Carter.

We'll never do anything about big government and excessive regulation by adding "another layer of bureaucracy" that will harass business, slow down government machinery and aggravate inflation.

The addresses: President Jimmy Carter (the salutation is "Dear Mr. President:"). The White House, Washington, D.C. 20004; Sen. Robert P. Griffin, 353 Russell Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; Sen. Donald J. Riegle, Jr., 1205 Dirksen Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515; and Rep. Guy M. Vander Jagt, 1211 Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

THE DECLINE OF THE AMERICAN SHOE INDUSTRY

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned over the adverse effect the importation of many products has had on American industries and on the jobs of thousands of American workers.

It is particularly unfortunate that the industries most vulnerable to foreign competition are those which are labor intensive and provide jobs for many semi-skilled workers who find it extremely difficult to find new employment. One of the industries that has suffered the most is the footwear industry. Many of our shoe plants are in small rural communities or towns and are often the largest or among the largest employers in the area. When they go out of business or layoff workers, this creates an immediate and serious economic and employment problem for the entire com-

munity. In these instances there are few available jobs for the unemployed to seek in the vicinity, and most workers are reluctant to leave their homes to move to other areas which might have more encouraging employment prospects.

One good example of this situation is my hometown—Portsmouth, Ohio. A major employer—a shoe factory—was forced to close down more than a year ago as a result of increased shoe imports, and hundreds of workers lost their jobs. Prior to the closing of this plant, the unemployment situation in this area was already unacceptably high—almost 20 percent. As the unemployment rates in adjoining counties are comparable, there are few, if any, available jobs for our unemployed shoe workers in their home town or nearby communities.

An excellent article appeared in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* on April 17, 1977, concerning the decline of the American shoe industry and the effect this has had on one community—Portsmouth, Ohio. I would like to take this means of sharing this article with my colleagues:

SHOE IMPORTS CRIPPLE PROUD INDUSTRY
(By Richard G. Ellers)

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO.—Ohio's shoe-making industry, with about 3,000 workers, is threatened with extinction, like an endangered animal species.

As in the 11 other major American shoe states, Ohio's shoe industry is barely a shadow of its former self. Fifty years ago, close to 40,000 people made shoes in some 30 Ohio factories.

The Depression and post-war competition took a toll of companies, plants and jobs. But the current foe is the low-cost foreign shoes that have captured 52% of the retail market.

In the dozen years since shoe importing began in great numbers, Ohio has lost an estimated 12,000 jobs and a dozen factories in shoemaking and related industries.

The swift decline of the American shoe industry in the face of imports was demonstrated clearly here, in river a town that once considered itself a shoe capital of mid-America.

In the 1950s, the city had 8,000 employees in five shoe factories and two others that made shoe parts and equipment.

Today, Portsmouth only has former shoe workers. About 1,200 are on unemployment compensation, having lost their jobs when Williams Manufacturing Co. closed last year.

Williams made women's fashion shoes that sold for under \$10.

Only five years ago, Williams management celebrated the company's 50th anniversary with glowing pride over increased sales at a time when imports had a substantial growing share of the market.

Today, the seven-story Williams factory stands empty, except for a financial vice president and a small staff closing out the company's books.

The production equipment was sold at auction. The buyers of some of the equipment said they would be shipping the machinery to foreign shoe factories.

Industry leaders today say the Williams boom of five years ago was misleading, that the company's increase in sales came not from improved marketing, but because Williams was reaching some markets that were abandoned when other shoe companies folded.

David F. Bussler, vice president of Boot and Shoe Workers Local 385 at the Williams plant, said the company did all it could trying to stay ahead of imports in its markets.

"We had a modern plant, the best equipment and good workers," Bussler said. "But

what can anyone do when the competition is from Taiwan and South Korea, where workers are paid only an eighth of American wages?"

"And you have to realize that, historically, shoe workers have been one of the lowest-paid trades in the United States."

Worker complaints here and in Ohio's still working shoe factories are bitter against President Carter.

They had expected Carter, a Democrat, to take their side against imports, partly because he had labor support in his campaign last year and particularly because he has emphasized the importance of employment in solving America's problems.

But earlier this month, Carter announced his rejection of the U.S. International Trade Commission recommendations that shoe imports be reduced to 1974 levels and tariffs be significantly higher for above-quota imports.

But instead of quotas and tariff control, the President said he is sending representatives abroad, starting in Taiwan and South Korea, to negotiate for voluntary export controls.

Carter said he would also ask Congress for higher unemployment pay and more job-retraining benefits for workers in shoe and other industries who lose their jobs because of high imports.

Company officials who deal with markets have very little hope that voluntary controls will work.

"They have tried that before and it failed," said George R. Utley, president of Irving Drew Corp. in Lancaster.

"They (the exporters) almost had the American market in control, and we'd be foolish to expect them to give it up now."

Shoe workers have also ridiculed Carter's proposal for increased aid to displaced workers as a solution to the import problem.

David L. Gray, regional director of the Boot and Shoe Workers of America, said, "Increasing and extending unemployment pay is not the answer. It just delays the problem."

"What do these people do when unemployment pay ends? There are no jobs, especially in an area like Portsmouth where unemployment has been running close to 20%."

"Age is another factor. At least 50% of the Williams people are past 55. There is no way they will get new jobs with or without job training or a federal anti-age discrimination law."

Trudy M. Legge, secretary-treasurer of the Williams union local, said federal retraining benefits are mostly meaningless to the women who were a majority of the factory's work force.

Mrs. Legge, divorced and supporting a 20-year-old son who cannot find work, recently became one of the first Williams workers to start retraining under the federal trade assistance program.

Although the factory closed last June, it took until recently for the bureaucratic paperwork to get the retraining program under way.

"I'm studying accounting at Shawnee State College, but, after 20 years, it is hard to be a student again," Mrs. Legge said.

The older workers problems here are complicated because the company's pension program is tied up in the mandatory review under new federal regulations.

Louis A. Kindelberger, financial vice president who is closing out the Williams Co., said the government's long delay in approving the final pension program has understandably worried the workers.

Shoe workers who still have their jobs are also worrying.

Ohio's three independent shoe companies make footwear that has been invulnerable, so far, to the cut-rate competition of imports because they make fewer shoes, but sell them for a higher price.

Irving Drew Corp. in Lancaster and Miller

Shoe Co. in Cincinnati make working women's shoes.

Brooks Shoe Co. in Nelsonville manufactures nuns and boys "service" shoes.

John W. Brooks, the owner, said he is trying to keep the plant "important proof" by concentrating on small specialized markets.

Arthur P. Weigand, president of Miller Shoe, said he thinks his "grandmother" shoe market is safe from imports indefinitely because "it is too small for the imports to compete in efficiently and, as good as the imports are, we have a higher degree of perfection."

Weigand said he has problems with supplies, rather than markets, due to the imports. Machinery is no longer manufactured and he must buy equipment from closed plants, such as Williams, for replacements and spare parts.

While their jobs seem safe, workers in these three independent plants are not ignoring the war against imports.

They've given up on Carter's support and are deluging Ohio's senators and representatives with letters, postcards and phone calls, asking them to override the President's decision and make the ITC recommendation into law.

Shoe workers and shoe plant operators are also angry at the operators of retail shoe stores and shoe departments in department stores.

They said, nationally, the retailers have been as strongly opposed to import controls as the manufacturers have been in favor of them.

Retailers contend the lower cost of imports keeps prices under control.

But many people, like William J. Burns, personnel manager at Miller Shoe, called it a "smokescreen that retailers use to hide their real motive, which is greed."

"What the public doesn't know is that a retailer buys an imported shoe at \$6 wholesale and sells it for \$19, in competition with the \$20 American-made shoe that wholesales for \$10."

"The retailer is not helping the public when he takes a triple markup on the cheaper imported shoe."

I am sure the situation is similar in many other communities throughout our country. It is my understanding that since 1968 more than 300 shoe plants have closed with the loss of over 70,000 jobs and \$500 million in annual payrolls. A great many of these plants, as I have mentioned, were in small communities and the impact of the job loss upon thousands of families and many small businesses has been devastating.

In Ohio alone, eight plants have been closed, and employment has been reduced by 18.7 percent in this time period. Inasmuch as imports are entering our country at a rapidly increasing rate, the situation is worsening. In 1968 shoe imports accounted for approximately 20 percent of domestic sales. Today it is estimated that imports have captured nearly 50 percent of the U.S. market. We face a possible demise of this vital industry unless action is taken to protect the industry from unfair competition resulting from low-paid foreign labor. This would, of course, greatly increase the financial problems of many American workers and small businesses and adversely affect the economic well being of many small towns, such as Portsmouth.

I strongly supported the recommendations made by the International Trade Commission calling for the imposition of tariff-rate quotas on the importation of footwear and joined with other con-

cerned Members of the House to urge the President to approve these recommendations. Regrettably, he rejected the ITC's recommendations and, instead, stated he would try to obtain relief for the industry by negotiating voluntary quotas with shoe-exporting countries.

I was tremendously disappointed at the President's decision as I very much doubt that these negotiations will provide effective relief for the industry. If the President's trade negotiator is unsuccessful in negotiating voluntary quotas that are adequate to protect our domestic industry, I feel we should seriously consider overriding his decision. This may be necessary if this vital domestic industry is to survive.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER'S PAPERWORK REDUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has submitted to the President, and the Commission on Federal Paperwork, of which I am privileged to be chairman, a number of recommendations for reducing the paperwork burden imposed by the Federal Government. Along with these recommendations, I am also inserting into the RECORD Mr. Richard L. Leshner's letter of transmittal to the President.

The recommendations forwarded by the chamber are based on the suggestions submitted by thousands of business men and women throughout the country as well as the ongoing work of the Paperwork Commission. I urge my colleagues to carefully consider these recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR ACTION TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL PAPERWORK BURDEN, PRESENTED BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 25, 1977

March 25, 1977.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to submit to you the National Chamber's recommendations for reducing the paperwork burden created by the Federal Government, in fulfillment of your request to our chairman, Herbert S. Richey, our vice chairman, William K. Eastham and me at our meeting on February 24.

National Chamber representatives have personally invited thousands of business men and women throughout the United States—and, in particular, our small business members through our Council of Small Business—to submit their suggestions and comments on this problem. Our recommendations are based on their pleas, as well as on the continuing work of the National Chamber and the Commission on Federal Paperwork.

The reduction of superfluous paperwork is closely related to your other major goals of government reorganization, regulatory reform and zero-base budgeting. To a large extent, success in reducing the paperwork

burden will depend on success in these areas as well. The National Chamber will strongly support your efforts to attain these highly desirable objectives.

Much has been promised over the years in each of these problem areas, but little has been accomplished. One major reason for lack of success, we believe, is that an ad hoc effort is totally inadequate. Continuous close monitoring by high level authority is necessary. It is for that reason that our report concentrates on organizational and management recommendations.

We sincerely believe that your vigorous personal leadership is the key to effective action in each of these areas.

Many of our members have sent to us and to the Federal Paperwork Commission specific examples of burdensome paperwork requirements. Because of the great volume of these submissions, we have not put them in the body of the report. We have, however, included a sample of the more interesting case histories and suggestions in an appendix.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. LESHER.

It will be of little avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood, if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be like tomorrow.—James Madison.

RECOMMENDED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should be divided into two separate suboffices: The Executive Budget Office (EBO), and the Executive Management Office (EMO), each headed by a deputy director of OMB.

The Executive Budget Office would be responsible for preparing the President's budget.

The new Executive Management Office would assist the President in applying sound management principles to the operations of the departments and agencies. The EMO would develop cost/benefit information on federal programs as a basis for selecting priorities; improve interagency and intergovernmental coordination; develop common standards for regulation, information collection and definitions; train and motivate agency executives; and control paperwork by serving as a clearinghouse for all new federal reporting requirements prior to their official promulgation.

2. Departments and agencies should be required to submit to the EMO and Congress comprehensive estimates of the potential paperwork impact of Administration bills providing for mandatory reports.

3. The Administration should require that reporting and record keeping assessments be published during the notice and comment period for all new or revised regulations issued by executive agencies.

4. The clearance function within the individual agencies should be strengthened so that unwarranted forms can be eliminated before coming to the EMO for review.

5. The ombudsman function which is now in the Commission on Federal Paperwork should be transferred to the proposed Executive Management Office. This ten-person function responds well to the public, is highly cost-effective, and is needed on a continuing basis.

6. Federal Government report forms should follow a standard format which provides essential facts about the information request, including:

A clear statement of the purpose of the request;

A statement as to whether a response is mandatory or voluntary;

An identification of the authority for the request—Congress, EMO, or an independent regulatory agency;

An explanation of the legal penalty for not responding to the request.

The standard format should include a readable print size, and adequate space for filing in the information requested.

7. There should be an increased effort to train the persons responsible for drafting federal questionnaires in the techniques of report form drafting.

8. Information requests should be coordinated to spread the reporting burden over the year, eliminating peaks which impose excessive burdens on respondents.

9. Requests from two or more federal agencies for identical or nearly identical information should be consolidated in one form so that respondents may report essential information once instead of many times. Submitting the same information to more than one agency is justified only when privacy and confidentiality are primary considerations.

10. The frequency of recurring reports should be stretched out to the maximum extent possible to minimize the reporting burden, consistent with the benefits to business of the information developed.

11. The Executive Management Office should establish an effective process for assessing the actual benefits of ongoing reporting programs.

RECOMMENDED CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

1. The Administration should prepare and strongly support legislation to require independent regulatory agencies to submit to the EMO a comprehensive estimate of the potential paperwork impact of bills and rules initiated by such agencies.

2. The Administration should urge House action to require that any bill involving reporting requirements be accompanied by a comprehensive estimate of the potential paperwork impact. (The Senate already has such a requirement.)

3. The Administration should support legislation authorizing the transfer from the General Accounting Office (GAO) to the proposed Executive Management Office the current GAO responsibilities for clearance and review of the information requests of independent regulatory agencies.

4. The Federal Reports Act of 1942 should be revised and strengthened to:

Involve the business community in the preparation of information requests so the information needs of the government are met with the least possible costs;

Require pilot testing of report forms with a representative group of the persons affected before the reports become mandatory;

Allow adequate lag time between the date a new or revised report form has been announced and the date on which a response becomes mandatory, to permit respondents to develop the required data;

Establish an appeals procedure through which respondent could challenge specific reporting requirements;

Require that agencies make public their reasons for not accepting suggestions submitted during the notice and comment period for proposed reporting requirements;

Require that all public use reports, both exempt and nonexempt, be "logged" in a computer facility to cross check data elements, thus minimizing duplication and facilitating measurement of the total burden on the public.

5. The Federal Government should reimburse expenses incurred responding to mandatory information requests made to obtain information essential for government policy decisions and not for the specific benefit of the businesses affected. Such federal paperwork burdens should be financed from the general revenues instead of constituting a special "tax" on the respondents. If the expense of mandatory surveys of business were

funded through the appropriations and budget processes, the cost of federal paperwork would be clearly identified for the information of the Executive Branch and Congress.

RECOMMENDED JOINT ACTION

1. A greater use of sampling techniques should be required in place of 100 percent canvassing. Exceptions should be made only when information about each and every business firm is clearly essential to achieve the objective of the survey.

2. Exceptions from most reporting requirements should be provided for very small businesses. It is important to include all business firms in basic census surveys which establish the conditions, problems, and trends affecting business. However, small businesses—such as those having ten or fewer employees, or a gross income of less than \$100,000—should be relieved of responsibility for responding to frequently recurring information requests.

HYDROPOWER—TAKING THE WATERS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, John B. Oakes, the senior editor of the New York Times wrote an "op-ed" article on the great potential for cheap hydroelectric power production from existing dams. The article, entitled, "Taking the Waters," heartily endorses the idea of moving ahead to obtain such cheap, environmentally compatible, and fuel-conserving power production. As he indicates,

The real problem isn't identifying the sites, as Mr. Carter seems to think, or in determining whether small-scale hydro production is economically feasible. (It is even possible now to produce power from flowing streams where there is virtually no fall of water.) The real problem is overcoming the inertia of old patterns of thought and the hostility of old vested interests, especially of the power companies.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that passage of the Small Hydroelectric Power Projects Act of 1977, which I introduced on May 24, would enable us quickly to show the country the advantage and feasibility of using existing dams for power production. I am inserting the article by Mr. Oakes for the benefit of my colleagues.

TAKING THE WATERS

(By John B. Oakes)

Tucked away in one paragraph of the 28-page fact sheet issued last month by the White House on President Carter's national energy program is this intriguing statement: "The President has directed the Corps of Engineers to report within three months on the potential for additional hydropower installations at existing dams throughout the country—especially at small sites." (emphasis added).

With these words Mr. Carter somewhat rectified his failure to make any mention, in his previous addresses to the nation and to Congress, of this long-neglected source of supplementary energy production that is relatively cheap, readily available and environmentally acceptable.

Mr. Carter may have deliberately played

down the potentialities of small-scale hydroelectric power because he did not wish to risk confusing it in the public's mind with those large-scale power and water-control projects on which he has been locked in battle with Congress.

There is no relation, however, between the two. One involves generation of electric energy through rehabilitation of small dams and installation of small plants to serve local needs on a decentralized basis without seriously damaging the regional ecology. The other is typified by such ruinous pork barrels as Dickey-Lincoln in the State of Maine—so hideously expensive that it is doubtful that they can ever become economically justifiable, quite aside from the permanent environmental damage they cause.

But it is quite a different story with small-scale hydropower. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, thousands of dams were built for a variety of purposes on millstreams and small rivers throughout the country, particularly in New England and New York. They powered grist mills, saw mills, paper mills; and eventually some were fitted out with installations for local generation of electric power, which ultimately fell into disuse or were altogether removed when large-scale power plants and regional distribution systems began to absorb the market.

It is these sites—plus many untapped navigation and flood-control dams in the Middle West—that afford a valuable and available source of easily, quickly and cheaply developed hydroelectric power. Ronald A. Corso, an official of the Federal Power Commission, estimates that if only 10 percent of the 50,000 existing small dams in the United States were developed to an average capacity of 5,000 kilowatts—which is very small indeed—the resultant hydroelectric production could save the equivalent of 180 million barrels of oil a year, about 6 percent of present oil imports. Put another way, these small dams could produce 24,500,000 kilowatts, increasing the present supply of hydroelectric power in the United States by more than one-third.

Representative Richard L. Ottinger of New York's 24th District points out that in this state alone there are more than 600 such untapped dams, which—if only 10 percent of them were put to work at that small 5,000 kw. capacity—could provide the equivalent of the total electric consumption of a city bigger than Albany. And on almost every tumbling stream of New England, there stand today several of these ancient dams—3,000 in all—harking back to a simpler past, when their water power was tamed to turn the mill wheels of another day. If small generators were installed in but 10 percent of these, they could produce enough electricity to supply a population equal to that of Boston.

From the investigations already conducted by such public agencies as the Federal Power Commission and by such private ones as the Development and Resources Corporation (headed by David E. Lillenthal, former chairman of T.V.A.), enough is already known about potential hydroelectric generation at small sites to warrant immediate and intensive Federal encouragement of this use of a permanently renewable natural resource.

Here is where Congress comes in. One way to encourage small-scale hydro-power technology, to which American manufacturers have given scant attention, would be through Federal grants to demonstrate various new techniques in small-scale power development. Another might be through low-interest loans for rehabilitation of existing dams and installations of small turbines and generating plants. Another might be through a form of investment tax credit.

The real problem isn't identifying the sites, as Mr. Carter seems to think, or in determining whether small-scale hydro production is economically feasible. (It is even possible now to produce power from flowing

streams where there is virtually no fall of water.)

The real problem is overcoming the inertia of old patterns of thought and the hostility of old vested interests, especially of the power companies. As President Carter says, this is a time for innovation—and the irony is that in this case, innovation means going back to first beginnings with modern technology now waiting to be used.

PRESIDENT CARTER'S NEW AFRICAN POLICY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following column by my constituent, Gen. Henry Huglin. General Huglin is a retired Air Force brigadier general and syndicated columnist. He comments on President Carter's new African policy. The article follows:

CARTER'S NEW AFRICAN POLICY

(By Henry Huglin)

The Carter Administration has a new and controversial policy approach for the problems and aspirations of the blacks in southern Africa—apparently intended to promote needed changes peaceably, gain influence, and undercut Soviet and Cuban moves.

The focus of the new policy is firstly on South-West Africa (Namibia), which the Republic of South Africa controls, and secondly on Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), but also on South Africa itself. President Carter has chosen to side clearly with the black Africans calling for early replacement of the present white-minority governments with back-majority governments.

This policy, obviously, stems partly from the emphasis on human rights that Mr. Carter has made a keystone of his foreign policy.

But this new policy is also apparently based somewhat on the hope that, by helping the black nationalists come to power in southern Africa, they will be pro-West and not be captured by the Soviets' and Cubans' wooing them with arms and advisors.

Our overly-outspoken UN ambassador, Andrew Young, has had a major role in the development of this new approach. And he recently played a major role at a UN conference in Mozambique which was focused on how to end white rule in southern Africa.

Further, Vice President Mondale recently met in Vienna with Prime Minister Vorster of South Africa, in furtherance of this new policy, for a frank exchange of conflicting viewpoints.

And President Carter said on May 17th that the U.S. is "willing to use all the levers we can to bring an end to racial discrimination in South Africa."

These developments are important. Much is at stake in Africa for our interests.

Great raw material resources that we will need are in that large continent. And the sea lanes for transporting 40% of the vital crude oil from the Mideast to Europe and to our country skirt Africa's shores and could be militarily interdicted from them.

Further, the nations of that continent have become a major target for geopolitical and ideological exploitation by Soviet Russia and Cuba, and somewhat by China.

The Soviets are making particularly great efforts in Africa. And their goal is not political evolution or economic betterment for the benefit of Africans, but power for their

clients and influence and bases for themselves.

Now, there is much reason for feeling that our country and other major non-Communist countries hold much more attraction for responsible black Africans than do the Russians, Cubans, or Chinese. We have more of what they really need and want: trade, and monetary, economic, and technological development aid.

The nub of the matter is what is the best way for our country to promote peaceable changes in Africa for the good of the Africans, black and white, and also avoid the area becoming more of an ideological and military battleground.

Now, few people will quarrel with our government standing four-square for human rights. But many may well quarrel with the one-sided public condemnation of southern African governments, policies, which may harden their positions against needed change, and thereby increase the possibilities of expanded guerrilla war.

And it has yet to be shown how this new policy will be even-handedly applied, if it will, to some black-ruled African nations, where the denial of human rights and perpetration of gross injustices are greater than in white-rural southern Africa.

With any policy—and ironically especially with one based on human rights concerns over southern Africa—we have to face the prospect that, if the leaders of the black nationalist movements do come to power there soon, they will follow the authoritarian path of most of the black-ruled African nations. In these countries there are widespread violations of human rights and, of the 38 changes of government that have taken place since blacks assumed power, all have been by coups, none by elections.

In some ways, the blacks in southern Africa—though greatly discriminated against—now have more rights, justice from the courts, and chances to be informed by a relatively free press than the majority of blacks in many of the black-ruled nations.

So, the situation is far from just "black and white" or even "black versus white." And President Carter's new African policy approach can be questioned on grounds of being overly moralistic, selectively applied racially, and naive as to what is effective in bringing peaceful democratic change to southern Africa and in countering the Soviets' and Cubans' moves in that area.

But we now need to hope that it will soon succeed—or be changed.

TRUTH IN LENDING—LAWYER'S AGITATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to have the creditor not liable for meaningless, technical violations of the truth-in-lending law.

Some people are aware that I have done this as letters have been received from various lawyers indicating support or opposition.

From time to time I want to share with my colleagues some of the feedback I am receiving from attorneys about the legislation, H.R. 5206.

Today's letter is from Mr. Tom Curtis of the Clark, Thomas, Winters & Shapiro law firm in Austin, Tex. This letter brings to light a very interesting point.

This point is that the vast amount of lawsuits being heard in the truth-in-lending area are lawyer-generated, not consumer-generated. The fact is that Mr. Curtis does not know of one instance where a consumer came forward to sue because he had been injured because of a violation of "truth-in-lending."

Instead, the situations Mr. Curtis is familiar with occur after a dispute arises, and the borrower has a lawyer brought in. This lawyer, knowing much of the incredibly technical and unclear requirements of the regulations promulgated under the truth-in-lending law, and knowing the strict liability of any technical violation of truth-in-lending by the creditor, immediately sets out to find a technical violation.

Please note, the consumer has not been injured, nor does he have a complaint. It is after the lawyer who sniffs out something to create one of the many lawsuits now underway under "truth-in-lending." Perhaps that is fair game, but it ought to be kept at a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from Mr. Curtis says it better than I, so I place the letter in the RECORD at this point:

CLARK, THOMAS, WINTERS & SHAPIRO,
Austin, Tex., April 29, 1977.

Re Proposed Amendment to Truth-In-Lending.

Congressman J. J. PICKLE,
Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

We have handled the defense of a good many Truth-In-Lending cases and so far as I know, none was ever instigated or brought to the attention of the creditor by the debtor himself. In other words, all of these cases came about as a result of some controversy existing outside the parameters of Truth-In-Lending which brought the contract to the attention of an attorney and subsequent to that time, the Truth-In-Lending violations were alleged by the attorney. The majority of these cases arose where the debtor could not make his payments and had either been sued by the creditor or threatened with suit, at which time he took the case to an attorney who discovered the Truth-In-Lending problems.

While I would not take the position that substantive violations of Truth-In-Lending should be without a remedy under Truth-In-Lending or some other law, it is apparent that with regard to the many many technical requirements of Truth-In-Lending, the debtors are not aware of them and in nearly every case, the action complained of once the case gets in the hands of a plaintiff's attorney, is for a technical violation of the law as opposed to a substantive violation where some conceivable injury has been caused the debtor.

Your proposal that the creditor substantially comply with the regulation would be of considerable help, depending on how substantial compliance is interpreted. To my mind, Regulation Z was intended to show the debtor the cost of credit and the simple interest rate that he would be charged, together with the total he would be expected to repay. I have no fault with that but the many intricacies of the law now exist as a legal trap for the creditor, even the wary creditor with adequate counsel. In short, it is virtually impossible to advise a creditor that his form is in compliance with Regulation Z. The law is simply too complex and there have been too many rulings requiring constant revision of the form making it all but impossible for the wary creditor to constantly stay abreast of the many interpretations. The small businessman, I sus-

pect, finds it wholly impossible to stay in compliance with the amorphous changes in the law.

This is somewhat akin to strict liability and if the creditor is to be punished in the form of statutory penalties and attorney's fees, without substantive injury to the plaintiff, these costs, where possible, will simply be an increased cost of doing business for those businesses that can pass it along.

BODY, MIND, AND NOISE

HON. CECIL "CEC" HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. HEFTTEL. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert in the RECORD information that I recently received from the Citizens Against Noise Association of Honolulu, Hawaii. The text of their research statement follows:

DOCUMENTED RESULTS FROM WORLDWIDE RESEARCH

Noise is a slow agent of death! (Dr. Vern O. Knudsen, a founder of the Acoustical Society, N.Y. Times Magazine, Nov. 23, 1969, p. 131.)

Commonsense awareness of the relationship between noise and the sleep needed for health has existed for centuries. In ancient Sybaris, 2500 years ago, roosters and forges were banned in residential areas. Julius Caesar banned chariots after 10 p.m. on Rome's stone-cobbled streets. Elizabethan England didn't permit wife-beating after 10 p.m. In many European cities less than a century ago you'd have known which house had an ill resident. Straw in front deadened the sounds of horse and carriage. "Quiet Zone—Hospital" is a taken-for-granted sign today. As one moves up the executive ladder so does insulation from the sound of typewriters, telephone, and talk. In ancient Hawaii all sound was taboo while fishing lures were tied. Legend has it noise made the fish god angry. Logie has it that tying a natural fiber lure took concentration. If it fell apart in the water—no fish!

Experiments with animals and noise show rapid advance of arteriosclerosis, a 25% increase in fetal deformities, 60% drop in fertility, loss of libido, convulsions, enlarged hearts combined with shrunken adrenals, ovaries, and kidneys, more tooth decay, nervous breakdown, and even death.

Testing people and noise has limits. There are no volunteers for mass autopsies to evaluate experiments. Studies of people who live or work in noisy places are well into the third decade in many countries. Initially done to document hearing loss, it is impossible not to be impressed by scientific recognition of physical, psychological and mental skills effects.

"Noise affects people's communication, sense of touch, vision, performance of skilled tasks, orientation and coordination... contributes to fatigue, loss of sleep, psychosomatic symptoms, and possibly impairments of circulation and brain functions." (1954: Army, Navy, Air Force Joint Committee on Hearing and Bio-Acoustics, Report No. 2.)

Noise rules have been part of public health legislation in Britain since 1960.

"We know that noise is as much of a health hazard as other pollutants." (1969: Keynote address of Dr. Gerald Dorman at Sixth American Medical Association Conference on Environmental Health—all on noise.)

"There is evidence that workers exposed to high levels of noise have a higher incidence

of cardiovascular disease, ear-nose-and-throat disorders, and equilibrium disorders than do workers exposed to lower levels of noise." (Environmental Protection Agency Report to the President, December 31, 1971.)

"Daily encounters with workplace noise may degrade hearing mask reception of desired sounds, heighten emotions and psychologic activity, disrupt concentration, or otherwise hinder job safety. The collective impact of these noise effects clearly poses a significant challenge to the employee's health, productivity and well-being." (1972: Health Education & Welfare Department study—Occupational Exposure to Noise, p. IV-16.)

"Acute noise exposure has been shown to markedly affect various hormone secretions. Immunological function can be affected. . . ." (1976: National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences report, pub. by Department of Health, Education & Welfare.)

"In disease states such as anxieties, duodenal ulcers, and other so-called tension ills, the additive deleterious effect of noise is real and immediate." (Dr. Lee Farr, writing in the AMA Journal 1967, Vol. 202, pp. 171-174.)

Noise and learning: Probably the most significant study of the effect of noise on classroom achievement was done in 1973. Elementary children living in four 32 story buildings built in air rights over a heavily travelled New York freeway were tested. Final evaluation was done on 54 children. Noise outside the buildings averaged 76-79 dBA (except when heavy trucks roared by). The apartment living rooms, with windows closed, ranged from 70 dBA at the lowest floor to 51 dBA on the 32nd floor. (Note: an increase of 10 dBA means twice as loud.)

When data was analyzed and adjusted for all variables, including educational attainment of parents, noise level (floor level) emerged as the most significant factor in aural word discrimination, speech, and reading achievement. Children in the quietest apartments consistently scored higher in all three categories than children in noisier school noise levels were also tested.) Mentioned in every book on noise since 1973, this study, by Glass, Cohen and Singer, was first reported in *Psychology Today* under the title "Urban Din Fogs the Brain."

Tests in Japan in 1964 (Nomura Research Group of Tohoku University); in England in 1969 (London Institute of Psychiatry) and the U.S. (there are three pages of bibliography in *Noise and Children: A Review of the Literature—Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 58, No. 4, Oct. 1975) all indicate that exposure to noise for extended periods affects the acquisition of speech, language, listening, and such related skills as reading. In other words, good listening situations are prerequisites to learning how to speak and read.

Last year Jerome Singer reported further noise and mental skills tests on subjects of varying ages. Skills were tested during noise exposure and just after it stopped. He found subjects in about two dozen experiments could not find errors when proofreading, did not persist as long in difficult or important problems, were not able to process conflicting information as well. (Internoise, '76, pp 499-504.)

Noise and hostility: Singer also found that during and after noise exposure subjects "were not as willing to do a favor when requested." He writes "The specific noise effect need not be very large for a large social effect to occur as the behaviors involved are strongly influenced by modeling and imitations. That is, one occasion of noise-influenced aggression may set the model for many others . . . a small number of affected people may trigger . . . aggression or failure to help others." (Remember the rocks thrown at Lale tour buses?) About every six

months a noise-triggered murder becomes a national news event.

Detroit riots investigator Dr. Edward Crip-pen told the American Public Health Association's 95th Annual Meeting he felt ghetto tension was related to interrupted sleep. (Robert Alex Barron, *The Tyranny of Noise*, 1970, p. 61.)

Noise and your eyes: Blood vessels in the conjunctiva around the eyes contracted and grew pale as noise increased to 87 dBA while blood vessels in the retina responded to noise as they did to digitalis—by expanding. Documenting photographs were taken by Professor Giovanni Straneo in Pavia, Italy (reported in Berland, p. 100.) Testing pupil enlargement during noise, Dr. Gerd Jansen found that where subjects attempted precision work during and after noise, "test objects were not where the subjects thought they were!" (Theodore Berland, *The Fight for Quiet*, 1970, p. 85.)

Blood pressure, heart, and health: At Pavia's Institute of Occupational Medicine, Dr. Straneo's experiments confirmed German results found by Jansen. His findings: Finger pulse arterioles contract, cutting their blood supply in half within three seconds of the start of 87 dBA noise. It took at least five minutes after the noise ended to return to normal.

A cardiologist, Straneo also found a correlation between noise and irregularities in EKG tracings. Noise, he concluded, can affect the heart directly through nervous system stimulation and indirectly by changing the dynamics of the vascular system.

By the sixth month after conception the fetus responds to noise with a faster heartbeat. In tests using a vaginal microphone, Karolinska Institute (Stockholm) researchers found how much noise was masked by the mother's body, placenta, etc., and determined that when the fetus heard 50 dBA (like a quiet office) for one second, fetal heartbeat went from 130 per minute as high as 170 per minute. (Berland, p. 85.)

Over 1,000 people who lived near Stockholm highways were asked a series of questions in a masked interview in which the subjects didn't know the purpose. Of those disturbed by traffic noise more than half answered questions on general health by complaining of bad stomachs, headaches, insomnia and nervousness. (Researcher was Anders Kajland at Karolinska Institute, reported in Berland, p. 56.)

Noise from London's Heathrow Airport apparently generated so much stress that a substantially greater number of affected residents required psychiatric treatment for mental illness than inhabitants of comparable, quiet, areas. (The Lancet, December 1969.)

Commissioned by the Government of Luxembourg to research the psychological impact of noise on factory workers, Dr. Jansen found workers in noisy industries were more aggressive, more likely to quarrel with foremen and had more than twice as many domestic problems than workers in quieter industries. (Berland, p. 92.)

Although it wasn't part of his contract, Jansen also measured physical reactions. He found: "Their skin was pale, the mucosa of their mouths were pale and dry, their hearts had extra systoles, their peripheral circulatory systems were apparently under high tension." (Berland, p. 92.)

Noise and sleep: Working with test volunteers who were awake and knew what the test was about, Dr. Jansen found peripheral vasoconstriction didn't show up until about 75 dBA. But in subjects who were sleeping soundly, blood vessels in fingers and toes constricted at 55 dBA. Just a fraction of a second exposure at 70 dBA took several minutes to wear off. Jansen's conclusion: "An adaption made by a person to noise is made at the intellectual level . . . your body can never adapt to noise." (Berland, p. 97.)

The person awakened by noise has no trouble making the connection, but many tests have shown that people who aren't aware of being disturbed by noise nevertheless shift from deep sleep to a lighter (dream phase) sleep. On awakening they feel fatigued, often have palpitations. (Dr. George Thiessen, National Research Council of Canada; Dr. Gerd Jansen (cited above); Dr. Nathaniel Kleitman, University of Chicago, among many others. Berland, pp. 87-88.)

Noise and hearing: "The population at risk with regard to noise-induced hearing loss may be greater than any other hazard in the work environment." (Occupational Exposure to Noise, HEW 1972, p. IV-7). Today's cities are often noisy as a factory. Recreational noise is often quadruple that of a factory.

How does hearing loss happen? Usually so slowly the victim isn't aware of change. Like the well-trod path where grass withers and vanishes, hair cells in the ear (which translate sound pressures into words, music or noises that tell us what is happening) shrivel and disappear with abuse.

To experience "temporary threshold shift" in hearing, leave the car radio at "on" when you turn off the ignition after coming home after work (or noisy play). When the ignition key turns your radio on in the morning at last night's comfortable volume, you'll be surprised at how loud it sounds. Yesterday's noise assault dulled your hearing for a time. Over the years recovery is less and less complete.

Women do hear better than men. Drs. William Wilson and William Zung ran tests at Duke University in 1965 and found that "women were three times more likely to be roused from sleep by noise than men." The difference starts to emerge at age eleven. Is it because boys play with firecrackers, shoot targets, ride motorcycles, and drive unmuffled cars more than girls? Is it because men are more likely to run power mowers, fly planes, work in noisy industries, hunt, and train for war?

By age 13 hearing starts to deteriorate in our noisy world. "Audiometer Tests of Tennessee students gave the sobering information that while only 3.8% of sixth-grade children had some degree of hearing loss, 11% of ninth-graders did, and 30.2% of freshmen in college. The last figure seemed implausible to Dr. David Lipscomb, director of Audiology Clinical Services at the University of Tennessee, so he repeated the study with the next class of incoming freshmen. Instead of obtaining the lower figure he hoped for, this time hearing losses were measured in 60.7%. Many of the deficiencies were for sounds at seldom-used frequencies, but even for those used in normal speech, hearing was below expectations for this age." (Lucy Kavalier, *Noise: The New Menace*, p. 38, 1975.)

No wonder there is talk of a "deaf generation" in this age of loud music. Lipscomb tested rock musicians. One out of three tested had "notable hearing losses for high-frequency tones." (Kavalier, p. 50.)

Noise and the elderly: Commonsense tells us falsely that noise is less of a problem to older people because hearing impairment is common. Not so. Sleep patterns differ with age. As we grow older it takes longer to fall asleep and deep sleep intervals are fewer and shorter. Noise intrudes more easily and sleep shifts quickly to drowsiness . . . or even anger, wakefulness and insomnia. Stanford Research Institute studies by sleep specialist Dr. Jerome Lukas showed noise intrusions disturbed hardly any five-to-eight-year olds, 18% disturbed the middle-aged, and 32% of noise intrusions disturbed the sleep of the elderly.

Another handicap for the retired is the feeling of being trapped by noise trespass into places where they live.

Many scientists now believe that much "old age hearing loss" results from noise. They point to the remote African Mabaan tribe where 70-year-olds hear as well as those in their twenties. Tests with equally quiet-environment, but high saturated fat diet tribes in India's Nilgiri plateaus showed no hearing losses, no high blood pressure and no heart problems! (Berland, p. 87.)

Going without food, or even water, may be easier than going without sleep. Sleep deprivation is a standard torture, brainwashing, or "third degree" weapon. It can reduce the victim to a robot, physically and mentally disabled. And, as Mt. Sinai Hospital's famous Dr. Smith Rosen says, "You may forgive noise, but your arteries never will." (Office, 1972.)

J. CRAIG SMITH MOURNED

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate to know many great men during my lifetime but none have surpassed the achievements of the late J. Craig Smith. A close personal friend, Craig was one of Alabama's finest sons and was recognized around the world as an astute businessman and an outstanding civic leader.

His long list of achievements, his dedication to his fellow man, and his concern for the betterment of the community will long be remembered by Alabama and his many friends across the Nation.

My deepest sympathies have been expressed to his wife, Mrs. Page Thompson Smith, and his daughter, Miss Mignon Comer Smith of Washington, D.C., and their prayers will be joined by the many friends and businessmen who knew, respected and admired this great American.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following two newspaper articles about J. Craig Smith, both of which appeared in the Sylacauga News and I join with Craig's many friends in this Congress who mourn his death:

ENTIRE TOWN DEEPLY AFFECTED BY LOSS OF AN OLD FRIEND

(By Joe Patton)

A profound sense of loss shrouded Avondale Mills along with an entire town Thursday morning at news of the unexpected passing of J. Craig Smith whose mourners here and abroad are legion.

One of the most admired and respected figures in the textile industry succumbed of a heart attack at Chicago, Ill. while attending a meeting of Illinois Central and Gulf Railroad directors.

The gravity of his loss will be measured in terms of what he meant to thousands in Sylacauga over the years, and a steady influence that spanned the textile world.

Although officially in semi-retirement since 1970, the former Avondale Mills president and board chairman remained active in company affairs as chairman of its executive committee, Avondale Educational and Charitable Foundation chairman, company director, and trustee of the Avondale Mills Employees Profit-sharing Trust in which he played a founding role.

At 71 years of age, Smith was pursuing a variety of business, civic, professional, and

philanthropic activity with the enthusiasm and vigor of a much younger man.

He was a giant among American textile leaders, the only American ever to serve as International Federation of Cotton and Allied Textile Industries president of which he was also an honorary life member. Smith had also served as president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute and the National Cotton Council of America and was a Liverpool Cotton Association, Ltd. honorary member.

Showered with numerous awards, among the proudest were his being honored by the editors of Dixie Business as Man of the South for 1970, his selection by the International Council of Industrial Editors as Communicator of the Year for 1970, the first time it had been made to anyone from the South or the textile industry, and his naming to the Textile Award by the Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association in 1971, only the third such award in ATMA history.

The grandson of Avondale Mills founder, B. B. Comer, who also served Alabama as a Governor and United States Senator, was named to the Alabama Academy of Honor in 1974.

Smith was a director of South Central Bell Telephone Company, Southern Bancorporation, Illinois Central Industries, Birmingham Trust National Bank, Protective Life Insurance Company, General Machinery Corporation, and First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Sylacauga, the latter also as board chairman.

His public office record included Alabama Water Improvement Commission, University of Alabama Medical Center Advisory Board, Alabama Education Study Commission, Alabama Institute for the Deaf and Blind executive committee, Alabama State Advisory Committee on Public Education, and Sylacauga Hospital board service.

The lengthy list of civic affiliations and offices Smith had enjoyed included The Eye Foundation, chairman and trustee, Alabama Safety Council, president and director, Sylacauga Park and Recreation Board, vice chairman, Boys Club of Sylacauga, honorary trustee, South Talladega County Chapter of the American Red Cross, honorary member, Sylacauga Exchange Club, honorary member, Sylacauga Rotary Club, president.

Smith had also served the Alabama Chamber of Commerce as president and chairman of the board, and was a member of the University of Alabama School of Commerce board of visitors.

His legacy to Sylacauga may be found in the new J. Craig Smith Community Center in testament to 32 years of faithful Sylacauga Parks and Recreation service, and the coveted J. Craig Smith Medal and Scholarship Award annually bestowed on an outstanding B. B. Comer Memorial School female graduate.

A wide, natural smile that became something of a Smith trademark belied a latent shyness, and a native business acumen the Virginia Military Institute graduate's early ambition to one day become a journalist.

The ability to identify with the common man and captains of industry alike endeared Smith to thousands of Avondale Mills employees who over the years attached a value beyond price to their coworker relationship. The pride with which his coworkers embraced a Zero Defects program that Smith was instrumental in implementing gave him as much satisfaction as any of his many achievements. It is a program that has made the Avondale Mills label a byword for quality throughout the textile industry.

A newspaper employee who had known Smith for many years, Jack Leach, used to shock associates with a "Hi, buddy!" greeting. Smith said not long ago it had often made his day. Of such was attached great worth.

Although a Birmingham native, Smith was considered one of Sylacauga's own.

Services for Smith were held Friday afternoon from graveside at Elmwood Cemetery in Birmingham, his wife, Page Thompson Smith, and daughter, Miss Mignon Comer Smith of Washington, D.C., among the multitude who mourn his passing.

Giants have walked this land, a remarkable J. Craig Smith among them.

CASUAL COMMENTS

(By Charles H. Greer)

"Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum" . . . the strains coming from the 73 beautiful voices of the Sylacauga Community Chorus as the second song of the evening concert was dedicated to the memory of Sylacauga's warm friend, J. Craig Smith. How sad it was . . . the realization this kind and friendly gentleman would never be among us again.

"Dominus tecum, Dominus tecum" . . . my mind kept going back ever so many years as I thought of the shock registered not only in this state, the country as a whole . . . but the world. And it was so true . . . because J. Craig Smith indeed had worldwide recognition both as an industrialist and as a humanitarian. I knew, of course, that my family had indeed lost a friend . . . but it was astounding to note how many, many people said the same thing over again and again . . . each had lost a very dear friend.

Yet, it was easy to understand because this man did not put off living . . . he made his own epitaph . . . his life drew it up in terms so flattering that only he could deserve such a glowing inscription.

Mr. Craig, as I respectfully called him, was one of three men who made a profound impact on my life. He, along with my father and uncle, Roe Greer, gave me impossible goals to emulate . . . but the examples of their lives have been the cause of any successes I might have. Our youngest son, Craig, is his namesake.

"Benedictus, benedicta tu in mulieribus" . . . so many remembrances kept coming back. The time his only daughter, Mignon, fell from her horse . . . and it was touch and go for a few days before his and others' prayers were answered. How he worried about his life's companion, Page, as she suffered ill health. That time he got lost trying to find our house where he was headed with a gift for his namesake who was sick. The many visits he would make to the office before he moved to Birmingham . . . and the way he would walk through the plant and shake hands with every employee. The last time our family had lunch with him . . . and he let Craig drive the Cadillac.

I remembered, too, the younger Craig Smith . . . particularly his love and respect for Donald Comer, Sr., one of the kindest and most gentle men in the world. And I can recall his stories of trips made in efforts to sell Avondale products when that great company like all the rest of the nation, was still recovering from the great depression.

Then there were those years when he edited the *Avondale Sun*. Man oh man, could he ever write. His editorials were sought out by all. Though he quit writing after his retirement, he never lost interest in the company publication . . . and would brag on his cousin, Donald Comer, Jr., and his editorials. He was particularly proud to see the *Sun* continually improve.

et benedictus fructus ventris tui Jesus . . . memories kept coming back. There is just no way (other than through his loyal and efficient secretary, Mary Edmunds) to count the many people who received gifts from him and Page as they returned from their European trips. Then, of course, there were countless cards and letters and phone calls concerning bereavements, birthdays, graduations and the list goes on.

I thought back to the many gifts . . . most of them in our library . . . that we have treasured from him. I remembered how much he enjoyed receiving mail and papers from home at hotels in London, Zurich . . . wherever he went. His was a fantastic sense of humor. I remember telling him once there was really no reason for him to write us . . . that we couldn't read his handwriting anyway. Mary wasn't on these trips to make them legible.

Just that afternoon at his services a beautiful young lady and a recipient of the J. Craig Smith Scholarship was telling us that Craig had called prior to her graduation from the University of Alabama . . . just to make sure she was graduating. He was proud she had accepted a job with Avondale Mills and was going into sales out of the New York office. Treasure was not alone. He checked on every one of his scholarship winners . . . and was so proud of them.

Maybe he didn't know every single member of the Avondale Family . . . but I think he did. I do know this . . . he numbered among his friends those employees from the lowest to highest category of employment. Many of them were there to tell their former boss "goodbye" Friday afternoon.

Sancta Maria, Mater Dei ora pro nobis peccatoribus . . . he just didn't have a jealous bone in his body. He wanted so much for people to advance in life's chosen professions. When it came to family, such was doubled in spades. He encouraged the younger generations of the Comer Family to enter the successful business begun by his grandfather, Gov. B. B. Comer.

No man I ever met could have enjoyed life more than Craig Smith. He loved to travel . . . enjoyed being wealthy but wore this wealth in a manner that demanded respect.

Perhaps the best description of Craig Smith as a man can be found in the writings of Henry Amiel who stated: "It is not what he has, or even what he does which expresses the worth of a man, but what he is." No one questions what he was . . . a gentleman.

nunc et in hora mortis nostrae. Amen . . . The hymn was finished as is Craig Smith's life. Today there is a living memorial to Craig Smith. It is probably one of the things for which he was most grateful and proud . . . the J. Craig Smith Community Center. I'm so glad he lived to see this beautiful center dedicated to his memory.

I just hope one of his associates did for him what he did for my dad . . . that of placing a vase of roses on top of the desk . . . as a tribute to an executive who had gone to his reward.

Somehow or other I can see my dad, Uncle Roe and Craig Smith all together once again . . . as I see my son with his grandfather in that great Valhalla in the sky.

CONTINUING CRISIS IN FOSTER CARE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I reported on the highly successful comprehensive emergency services program in Nashville. Today, I would like to discuss another project which has modeled itself after the Nashville design and achieved similarly successful results, the CES program in San Francisco.

With full funding of Child Welfare Services, title IV-B of the Social Security Act, as contained in H.R. 7200, and my own Foster Care and Adoption Reform Act of 1977, many more communities would be able to replicate this highly proven and cost-effective alternative to our present system which deemphasizes prevention and reunification in favor of expensive, long-term maintenance.

In 1974, before the CES program existed in San Francisco, more than 800 children were annually admitted to public custody. There were no emergency foster home beds, no Outreach programs, and no in-home services to prevent the need for foster home placement. Thus, as in so many cases, the first intervention in a family crisis was by police, not by potentially helpful social workers, and the result was removal of the child, not the offering of emergency services. In this manner, children are forced into a system with very little accountability where many do not belong and from which many exit only after years of needless or inappropriate placement.

Within only 2 years of that situation, the CES program was achieving major reforms. The administrative procedures were streamlined and similar programs were merged to provide more effective assistance:

Children in Youth Guidance Center Dependent Cottage: 1974, 24.3 daily; 1976, 2 daily (45 percent for less than 1 day).

Emergency Foster Beds: 1974, 0; 1976, 22. Special Subsidy to Emergency Foster Parents: 1974, 0; 1976, \$100/month.

Adolescent Shelter Beds With 24-hour intake: 1974, 16; 1976, 32.

24-hour intakes for Emergency Foster Homes & Adolescent Shelter: 1974, 0; 1976, all on 24-hour intake.

24-hour, 7-day outreach: 1974, 0; 1976, 6 teams.

Reduction petitions filing dependent children: 1974, 37/mo.; 1976, 16/mo (down 43 percent).

Increase in intake of CES Unit over 1974: 32 percent.

Impressive as these results are, such programs are so financially strapped, because of inadequate Federal support that other aspects of the CES project go wanting. San Francisco's CES has not been able to develop emergency caretaker and homemaker services and respite care which would dramatically reduce the need for the removal of children from their homes. The CES staff has only been able to partially meet their plan for emergency family shelters and emergency child care. Nor are San Francisco and Nashville alone in demonstrating that such preventive services programs can work effectively. In New York City, a study by the Child Welfare League several years ago disclosed that the average stay of children in foster care was nearly 5½ years. Over 30 percent of the children reviewed had no discharge plans whatever, but would indefinitely remain in foster care at an annual cost of \$5,000 to \$13,000.

A preventive service program was initiated on an experimental basis to attempt to alter this sad and expensive state of affairs. Several services, of the sorts which would be provided with the foster care reforms contained in H.R.

7200, were offered to 373 children in an experimental group. The results of the year-long project were reported in HEW's publication, *Children Today*, November-December 1976, in the article from which the following is excerpted:

REDUCING FOSTER CARE THROUGH SERVICES TO FAMILIES

(By Mary Ann Jones)

According to nearly every measure, better results were obtained among the experimental group than the control group, usually to a significant degree. Some of the highlights of the findings follow:

The project was successful in both preventing and shortening foster care placements.

Of those children home at the time of assignment to the project, only seven percent of the experimental group but 18 percent of the control group had entered placement by the end of the evaluation period.

Of the children starting out in placement, 47 percent of the experimental group, compared to 38 percent of the control group, had returned home by the end of the evaluation period.

During the time that cases were open in the project, the children in the control group were in care for an average of 24 days longer than the children in the experimental group. If the experimental group children had spent the same number of days in care, this would have amounted to an additional 44 years of foster care during the project year alone!

These positive effects of the project were even more marked when a follow-up on the whereabouts of the children was conducted six months after the end of the evaluation period. This notable increase in the impact of the demonstration services was most evident among the children who started out in placement. At the time of the six-month follow-up, 62 percent of the children in the experimental group who were in placement at the time of assignment to the project had gone home, as compared with 43 percent of the children in the control group.

The reduction in foster care was accomplished without detriment to the well-being of the children in the experimental group and it was accompanied by many positive changes in the functioning and problem situation of the families.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The savings in foster care expenditures resulting from one year of operation of this project with the 373 families in the experimental group are estimated to be over \$2 million. Approximately \$286,000 in foster care costs were saved during the project year alone on the 663 children in the families which received the intensive services. Additional savings of about \$1.8 million in foster care expenditures are expected to accrue over the next four years because of the reduction in placement with this sample of children.

A second question, of course, is how much it cost to save foster care expenditures that were, perhaps, in excess of \$2 million. The total reimbursement to the participating agencies for the demonstration services (other than foster care) during the evaluation year was \$1 million. For a variety of factors related to the demonstration nature of the program, such as the slow build-up and low turnover of caseloads, and the heavy reporting and travel demands, we think the reimbursement figure greatly exaggerates the cost of providing such services on an ongoing basis. In addition, the participating social service districts were unable to estimate the non-foster care costs of serving children in the usual way in their system. So, while we had a figure for providing services other than foster care to the children in the experimental group (the \$1 million figure), we had no

comparable figure for the children in the control group. For all of these reasons, we feel a more accurate reflection of the additional costs incurred by providing the demonstration services would be in the neighborhood of \$500,000 during the evaluation year. In sum, a \$500,000 investment in services in one year yielded a savings estimated at over \$2 million in foster care expenditures over five years.

These figures do not include the cost of any further service that might be required to sustain the gains achieved during the evaluation period, nor do they include the increased AFDC costs to maintain the families re-established as a result of the project. On the other hand, neither are the continuing non-foster care costs of the control group included, nor the myriad costs and benefits that might accrue as the result of this project, as the children from both the experimental and the control groups grow into adulthood.

SERVICES PROVIDED

Families in the experimental group received about twice as many service contacts during the evaluation period as the families in the control group. The principal differences were in the number of in-person interviews with the mothers during the eight and one-half months that the average case was open (17 interviews in experimental cases versus 10 in control cases) and the number of telephone contacts (29 versus 9). The experimental workers also had much more frequent contact with other community resources.

Many more kinds of services were provided to families in the experimental group. A significantly greater proportion of them received every service about which we inquired except placement of children and psychological or psychiatric evaluation or treatment. Obviously, the demonstration was successful in delivering a battery of preventive and rehabilitative services to project families.

The work with the families in the experimental group was active in many respects in addition to the number of service contacts and the kinds of services delivered. Over 75 percent of the interviews were conducted outside of the office; the workers most frequently described their principal role in interviews with family members as one of giving advice, guidance and direction; and in one-third of the cases the workers engaged in special advocacy efforts on behalf of the clients, particularly with the income maintenance system.

There are many, many communities in which these first steps to improving child service programs will not be made without more Federal support. That level of funding can be provided the States and local communities—which already outspend the Federal Government in this area 7 to 1—with the passage of H.R. 7200, which I urge my colleagues to support enthusiastically.

LLOYD C. FOWLER—PUBLIC WORKS
MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a gentleman I have known for many years. Mr. Lloyd C. Fowler, the chief engineer of the Santa Clara Valley

Water District, has been chosen by the American Public Works Association and seven other organizations cosponsoring National Public Works Week as one of the "Top Ten Public Works Men of the Year."

Mr. Fowler is a registered civil engineer with over 25 years of experience in irrigation, hydraulics, flood control, water supply, and river control works. He is a member of several professional societies and currently serves as president of Watercare, the California Association of Reclamation Entities of Water.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating Mr. Lloyd C. Fowler on his selection as a "Man of the Year."

INVESTIGATES RELIGIOUS "BRAIN-WASHING"

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in February, more than 40 of my colleagues joined me in asking the Attorney General or his principal deputy to meet with experts in the area of "brainwashing." Several other Members of the House and the other body contacted the Justice Department on their own. We hoped we would be able to provide Department of Justice officials with some information to help them understand better the allegations of "brainwashing" that have been raised against several of the seemingly religious cults with which we are all familiar.

The meeting was requested because many parents of young adult cult members are convinced that their children have been brought into and kept in these cults against their wills. I decided to approach the Justice Department because it is charged with the responsibility to investigate and prosecute suspected violations of Federal law.

After some initial difficulties, we managed to hold a meeting on May 18. Although one of the original experts whom I had invited was unable to attend, the meeting with officials from the Criminal Division included professionals with considerable knowledge of the legal, psychological, and ethical implications of the charges that have been made by the parents and several former cult members.

This was an informal informational meeting, and no prepared statements were issued. I shall, however, ask the Justice Department to comment officially on this meeting in the near future.

In the meantime, I believe that I owe it to my colleagues to summarize my impressions of what I thought were the major points discussed.

I appreciate and respect the constitutional limits that must be imposed on any matter so closely linked to the first amendment. This does not mean, however, that every activity of every re-

ligious group is beyond legal investigation. The courts in the past have distinguished between legitimate religious activities and those which have no legitimate connection to religion.

The central question in my mind is whether these young people freely are choosing to remain with these cults. In response to this query, I in turn was asked questions that emphasize the difficult preliminary matters which must be settled before the question of freedom of action can be answered in a legal sense.

How do you define a "cult"? One person's cult may be another person's religion. We must remember that at one point or another in history, nearly every religious group has been labeled a cult in the eyes of society.

Even if you should be able to define the type of organization that you seek to investigate, and if you are able to show that it is not being investigated because it is a religious group, another problem emerges. How can you prove "brainwashing," or coercion? What appears to be coercion to one person may in fact be a sincere religious conviction. With all of its advances, medical science cannot emphatically distinguish between the two.

In essence, I believe that the Justice Department was asking how one could develop a test which would pass a first amendment challenge and show beyond a reasonable doubt that improper influence had been used against a cult member's free will. I confess that for this I have no answer at this time, but I also think that, with its considerable resources and expertise, the Justice Department should be able to establish a plausible test.

I recognize the difficulties this issue creates. When a person's life and liberty are at stake, we correctly should not be frivolous with accusations; this narrow view of criminal laws may appear to be insensitive to some people, but it is a proper point of view legally and constitutionally.

I am convinced that we need a redefinition of our legal terminology. Last year, the Justice Department presented its policy in a letter to me, and I had that letter included in the January 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This policy is based on major court cases a generation old. Over the years, we have learned that, indeed, brainwashing exists. The experience of Korean war POW's substantiates this fact. It often takes decades for the law to recognize medical facts. Perhaps a test case is needed to determine exactly where we stand now with respect to the law's interpretation of this matter.

I did not ask the Justice Department to initiate an investigation of any particular cult or case. I hope, however, that the officials with whom I met will review with an open mind the comments that were made and will consider the possibility of examining in greater detail the allegations they have on file.

In the near future, I shall ask the Justice Department to indicate to me whether or not it intends to modify its

earlier position in light of our meeting. Naturally, I shall advise my colleagues of whatever reply I may receive.

Mr. Speaker, nobody need tell me that this is a complicated and sensitive issue. Many parents will think that nothing was accomplished at this meeting, and many civil libertarians will condemn its occurring in the first place.

I requested this meeting because I am convinced that our federal law enforcement officials must consider this problem in greater detail than they seem to have been doing in the past. Many of the parents and friends of cult members feel helpless in light of what they consider governmental indifference toward this problem. Their frustration has led to such activities as kidnapping and deprogramming. While I do not condone these actions, I am concerned about the entire situation, and I hope that Justice will not assume that there is nothing it can do in response to allegations being raised against the cults.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, many difficult questions have been posed, and few of them have been answered. Perhaps they cannot be answered to everyone's satisfaction. In any event, I hope that some light has been shed on this problem.

LET US PRESERVE OUR FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention an article that was written by Dr. Stephen D. Lockey which brought him the Freedoms Foundation Award. In this article he expresses his concern for preserving freedom in this country and the whole Western culture. I am including at this point in the RECORD this article because I think that it will be of some interest to my colleagues:

FREEDOM

(Let Us Preserve Our Freedom: The Most Expensive And Valued Commodity In The World)

(By Stephen D. Lockey)

Freedom is yours to defend and uphold. For many years, newspaper and periodical headlines have presented to the American public examples of rapport between the East and West. President Gerald Ford works actively towards bridges to the East. The foreign policy academicians present views of peaceful engagement and cooperation (détente, cultural exchange, athletic contests). The ultimate questions still remain:

1. What are the present Communist activities which bear upon this subject, and,
2. Are the Communist regimes really reaching accommodation with the West, or are recent actions merely within the context of historical Communist aims of expansion and ultimate world rule?

In this letter, I will try to present Soviet Foreign Policy in a historical prospective pointing out those significant factors which bear upon present and past Soviet world conduct.

The Soviet geography reveals through the centuries the most pressing force upon her

foreign policy. Although most good Marxists would probably deny the importance of the United States to Soviet Russia's geographical position; this fact stands out significantly throughout her long history.

Geo-politicians had been aware of said fact for at least fifteen decades. No natural limits exists to which the United States of Soviet Russia could define or direct her energies. Due to the vast plains and steppes, the country is almost indefensible with the Russian boundaries often reflecting the strengths or weaknesses of her past and present rulers. The traditional aims of the Russian foreign policy are to absorb weak neighbors and to exercise as much control over those unwilling to yield and capable of resistance. Russia's specific territorial objectives have always been sea-outlets, ice-free ports, the subject of historical drives towards the Straits, the Persian Gulf, and the Yellow Sea.

The great demands placed upon Communist rulers have established a need for unity and centralization. Although her Constitution is Federal in form (distribution of powers from the top down), the Soviet Union perpetuates the old Tsarist tradition of central control of the Communist party. This control is exercised most rigidly.

Soviet territorial hunger can often be compared with a rancher, who when questioned why he was acquiring so much land, said, "I don't want much land, I just want that which joins my ranch." So it is, with the United States of Soviet Russia—she merely wants the security of ruling all the land that adjoins her. As she expands through the device of using subservient communist parties to control or to gain control of nominally independent nations, with the result that her borders extend and there are more neighbors to absorb.

Historically, considerable debate has taken place over Franklin D. Roosevelt's actions at Yalta. One aspect is now clear: the United States of Soviet Russia received her go-ahead to proceed with her ambitions and expansion. Franklin D. Roosevelt's closest advisor, Harry Hopkins, stated after the Yalta conference: "The Russians had proved that they could be reasonable and far-seeing, there wasn't any doubt in the minds of the President or the rest of us (with the exception of Winston Churchill) that we could live with them and get along with them peacefully as far far into the future as any of us could imagine."

The post-World War II era provided Russia with her great opportunity to fulfill five centuries of expansionist plans and dreams. She contends that her moves were within her legitimate spheres of interest, and were of absolutely no concern to the West. Thus, with almost 200 armed divisions, she filled the vacuum left by the Allies, who as now know, pulled their troops out of occupied areas too rapidly. Not until the Soviet Union became a threat to the interests of the United States and the freedom loving countries of Europe, did we answer the challenge; a challenge answered only after millions of people were enslaved (please read Gulag Archipelago by Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn).

One may define, therefore, the Soviet Union's drive to the seas, her search for agricultural lands, and her insatiable need for world recognition in the terms of Communism, pan-slavism, messianism, or Colonist-imperialism.

The ends have remained immutable and distinguished or guided by differing principles, Communism today has a direct legacy in Russian history.

As we proudly celebrate the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of our Nation, the Land of the Free, it becomes the task of the United States to remember our national interest and the national interests of free men everywhere. If cultural bridges, detent, or athletic

contests, in anyway serve as an avenue for communistic expansion or the enslavement of more people, then we must re-analyze this game. Let us divorce ourselves from gaming with the Soviet Union in every manner and look to the end to which she hopes to gain in close contact with the West. If these ends are consistent with our policy, let us proceed. Five centuries of Russian rule counsel extreme cautions.

RUSSELL DAM

HON. DOUG BARNARD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution is fortunate to have on its editorial staff Mr. Bill Shipp. I have found myself both agreeing and disagreeing with him, depending on the issue of the day, but I always respect his lucid reasoning.

In yesterday's edition, he addressed himself to the controversy surrounding the proposed Richard B. Russell Dam under construction on the Savannah River between Georgia and South Carolina. Since the Appropriations Committee has reported out a bill for continued funding of the dam, and we in the House will likely be voting its fate in the coming weeks, I urge my colleagues to review his arguments in favor of the Richard Russell Dam's completion, and include it to be reprinted in the Extension of Remarks:

RUSSELL DAM

(By Bill Shipp)

A few centuries hence, our successors in these parts may send out an expedition to explore the wilderness area near the old town of Elberton. There they may find huge mounds of dirt and land that once was cleared and allowed to grow over. They will wonder what they have discovered. Is it a monument or tribute to some long-lost cause?

That is exactly what it is here and now. It is a monument to the fiscal irresponsibility of the federal government of the United States in the 1970s and a symbol of faltering efforts to develop sources of energy in the '70s and '80s.

These mounds and flat space, unless the political winds suddenly shift, will be the residue of plans and an expensive but abandoned startup on construction of the Russell Dam and Reservoir on a desolate stretch of the Savannah River.

The excavations and beginning of a dam represent \$21 million in taxpayers' money. They represent a long-term commitment to construct a hydroelectric dam between Lake Hartwell and Clark Hill. They represent the pledges of five previous Georgia governors, including Jimmy Carter, to support the Russell Dam. (Carter as governor signed off on a promise that the state would help provide recreation in the area once the dam and lake were in place.)

As President, Carter asked Congress to kill 15 water projects, including the Russell Dam. Carter gave environmental concerns as his major reason for putting the Russell Dam project on the chopping block.

Some observers believe, however, that the Russell Dam was the sacrificial lamb used by Carter to soothe governors and congressmen

from other states who were irate at him for killing their water projects.

"See, I struck down a water project in my home state, so why are you fellows so upset?"

A House subcommittee has restored funding for the Russell project, and it is expected to go to the floor for a vote sometime in June.

I called an old friend in Washington to inquire about the project and the \$21 million of our money that may have been thrown down the drain. "Twenty-one million dollars is nothing," he said. Strange how Washington changes a fellow's perspective.

Nevertheless, if environmental concerns are now so important in the area, why weren't they used to kill the project five or six years ago? The same environment existed then as exists now.

I sympathize with the conservationists. But they made their pitch and lost \$21 million ago. This \$276 million project that would be used mainly to generate electric power needs to be allowed to move forward. The Georgia Electric Membership Corp. already has agreed to buy every unit of power produced by the generators at Russell Dam.

If the Russell Dam were to be built in a virgin river and forest area, I would say amen to the objectors. But it is not. That stretch of the Savannah River was torn asunder long ago by upstream development including Lake Hartwell. The stretch of river below Hartwell now runs through scrub woods and barely qualifies as a creek or branch much of the time because of the regulation of the flow at Hartwell. Carter also objects on the basis that as many as 60 families would be displaced by the project.

Let's face it. If the Census Bureau is correct, this stretch of the Savannah should be named the Welfare River. A large number of inhabitants in the area live on annual wages well below the poverty level. Hopefully, a new dam and recreation area would provide new and better employment opportunities.

Now we could make a point here of asking how Jimmy Carter can call off an energy-producing project while he calls for greater production of energy? That is not really fair. The conservationists have some good points in their arguments, all of which were made long ago.

But any taxpayer, including the bird-and-bunny folks, should be incensed at seeing \$21 million thrown away simply to mollify some disgruntled congressmen who lost out on projects in their home states.

OUR NEW IMMIGRATION CHIEF COULD BENEFIT FROM ON-THE- JOB TRAINING

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, Leonel J. Castillo was sworn in as the new Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and already he has become a controversial figure. As the representative of a district which has a relatively high concentration of illegal aliens, I am very much concerned with Mr. Castillo's seeming desire to down-play the illegal immigration problem. According to recent news articles, he feels we really cannot tell whether illegal aliens have a positive or negative impact on this country because we do not have any hard figures on the actual numbers of illegal immigrants here or how

much they cost us in social services and lost wages. He concedes that there are additional costs associated with having more people in the community, but that those costs are offset if they are working and generating more revenue and paying property taxes.

With that kind of attitude we are never going to get to the root of the problem. Has Mr. Castillo seen recent apprehension figures of his own agency? In April alone, 3,996 illegal aliens were apprehended in northern California and 79 percent were employed, many earning substantial wages. Sixteen of those apprehended were receiving welfare or other public assistance. What about the costs to our school systems and those expensive bilingual education programs? What about medical care costs which county governments must absorb because illegal aliens are not covered by Medicaid? I have evidence to show that illegal aliens are costing California taxpayers millions of dollars annually for emergency medical care alone. The list goes on and on.

But even if one were to concede that the costs of illegal aliens in lost wages and social services were offset by their contributions to this country, their effect on U.S. population growth cannot be ignored. According to the Environmental Fund, illegal immigration is the source of almost half of our population growth. This is, of course, a nation of immigrants, and I have consistently supported a liberal immigration policy. However, we already admit roughly 400,000 legal immigrants each year, more than the total number of immigrants accepted by all of the rest of the nations on Earth.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service apprehended more than twice that many illegal aliens last year, 900,000, and whether or not Mr. Castillo wishes to believe his own people, they say we are only skimming the surface.

Continued population growth in the United States is certainly incompatible with a healthy human and natural environment and I hope our new Commissioner will take cognizance of the role illegal immigration has in that growth. I do not favor sealing our borders or isolating us from the poor people of the world, but that does not mean that I favor unlimited and uncontrolled immigration. Hopefully on-the-job training will give the new Commissioner the insight into the illegal alien problem he surely will need to effectively lead the one agency of our Government charged with enforcing our immigration laws.

In closing, I might say that I applaud Mr. Castillo's expressed desire to place increased emphasis on providing services to immigrants and their families, a function which has been given reduced priority by INS in recent years and which has resulted in a tremendous backlog of applications by aliens seeking legal entry into this country.

I insert for my colleagues attention an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 19 by staff writer Frank del Olmo, who recently interviewed the new Commissioner:

NEW IMMIGRATION CHIEF SPELLS OUT HIS VIEWS

(By Frank del Olmo)

In marked contrast to his controversial predecessor, the new U.S. immigration service chief said here Wednesday that there is "mixed evidence" as to whether the impact of illegal immigration in this country is positive or negative.

In his first press conference since being sworn in Friday as commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Leonel J. Castillo expressed several views that differed from those of the previous commissioner, Leonard F. Chapman.

Castillo, a 38-year-old Mexican-American from Texas, said "it is very hard to get firm figures" on the number of illegal immigrants in the country, and added that "the approach I'd like to take is to use only those figures that are documented and verifiable."

One such documented figure cited by Castillo was the more than 800,000 illegal aliens apprehended in the United States last year, almost a tenfold increase from the number of INS apprehensions a decade ago.

"Those figures are high enough to justify increased attention to this problem," Castillo said.

Castillo indicated he would not speculate as to the number of illegal aliens that might be in the country, as Chapman did on occasion, because no firm figures are available.

Chapman, who usually estimated the number of illegal immigrants in the United States at from 6 million to 12 million, was often criticized by pro-immigrant groups for exaggerating the numbers of illegal aliens in order to create anti-alien feelings.

And unlike Chapman, who said that illegal aliens cost the United States millions of dollars in social services and lost wages, Castillo said the "actual costs" of illegal immigration also are not clear.

"It's true there are additional costs associated with having more people in your community," Castillo said. "But if they are working, they are generating revenue. If they live in houses they pay some property taxes."

Although illegal immigration is now being debated at the highest levels of government after years of neglect, Castillo said any final solutions are still a long way off.

"You will see a lot of action toward solving the illegal immigration problem over the next few months," he said, "but this problem has developed over the last decade and it will still take some time."

Castillo said that in the meantime, he will begin instituting immediate changes in INS procedures to reduce administrative problems that have developed in the agency in recent years due to manpower shortages.

He announced that on June 5 a special crash program will begin in six major cities, including Los Angeles, to reduce a backlog of applications by aliens seeking legal permanent residence in the United States.

The program will begin in Los Angeles, the busiest INS facility in the country, where a task force of 20 immigration officers and 30 clerks will work on a backlog of 8,600 applications.

Other cities where task forces will be formed are New York, Newark, San Francisco, Miami and Chicago.

Castillo said other INS programs would be launched soon to increase automation, provide overtime work for agency personnel, and to improve law enforcement along the border.

Castillo said that he, like President Carter, favors the concept of granting amnesty to illegal immigrants who have lived in the country for some time and developed "equity."

He warned, however, that an amnesty plan is still "quite a ways from becoming an actual program" because it must be approved by

Congress even after being proposed by the President.

During his visit to Los Angeles Tuesday, Carter said his Administration's new policy on immigration would be made public in about two weeks.

In addition to amnesty, Castillo said, the President's immigration policy will include: Sanctions against employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants. Still being debated are whether those penalties should be civil or criminal, Castillo said.

Stricter enforcement of existing laws which can be used to keep workers from being exploited by unscrupulous employers such as federal safety regulations, minimum-wage laws and income-tax regulations.

More policing of U.S. borders to cut down on the number of illegal entrants.

Proposals for international financial activity to stimulate the economy of Mexico and other countries that send large numbers of illegal immigrants into the United States.

Castillo said that proposals for a new identity card or work permit that would be carried by all persons wanting to work will probably not be part of the Administration package.

He said the idea of a universal identity card was opposed by Atty. Gen. Griffin Bell both as a possible infringement on civil liberties and because of its potential cost.

While the idea of a new identity card is not dead, Castillo said, "It's limping pretty badly."

EDWARD W. LITTLEFIELD

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great man, a former constituent celebrating today his 80th birthday—Mr. Edward W. Littlefield. I make special note of this occasion not only because Mr. Littlefield is a fine American, but because his life provides an example of a life well lived—one of responsibility, patriotism, energy, civic involvement, and a constant effort toward education and self-improvement. It is important that we recognize this kind of positive life as an example to others, especially the Nation's youth.

Mr. Littlefield would be a notable individual even if one only looked at his public life and activities. He served briefly in the Army at the age of 17, and was disappointed that World War I ended without giving him a chance to get in on the action. He began a college education at Harvard with the idea of a career in writing. There is little doubt he would have succeeded in that endeavor, as evidenced by his publication of numerous articles and letters throughout his life.

His love of the outdoors, however, got the better of him, and he transferred to the University of Michigan and earned a master's degree in forestry. Mr. Littlefield's abilities took him to the position of Assistant Commissioner for the New York State Conservation Department. Throughout his career, he was an ardent advocate of protecting our remaining forests and wilderness. After retiring in 1952, he taught both at Syracuse Uni-

versity in New York and at the University of Michigan.

Despite this distinguished public career, it is as a friend, a father, a grandfather and a man of limitless interests and experiences that Mr. Littlefield has made his special impact.

Mr. Littlefield's childhood and youth were full of the exciting experiences that were a part of the robust and energetic Nation of the early part of this century. There were the times in Boston—the marathon, the symphony, the great molasses explosion, the Boston police strike, the famous Harvard-Yale football game, and camping on Cape Cod. And there were the thrills of the first movies, the model T's and the flying machines. I might add that he tells these stories, and hundreds more, with a gift for "spinning yarns" that has become all too rare. The fortunate audiences of his tales invariably feel as though they are living those times and events themselves.

He has always been a man of intense devotion to his family. His strong character has served as the single greatest model for his seven grandchildren.

Then there are his numerous and richly varied hobbies: classical music, literature, current events, public speaking, the German language, forestry, health, the Unitarian Church, writing, politics, and poetry, just to name a few.

Let me close by saying that Edward Littlefield has lived the kind of life to which we all might aspire. His life has been a model for all of us, and his influence upon those he has touched will last for many generations to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, due to your appointment of me as a member of our delegation to the recent Council of Europe meeting in Strasbourg I was necessarily absent from the House of Representatives on April 27, 28, and 29. There were a number of recorded votes taken on those days and had I been present I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 156, "yea."
Rollcall No. 157, "no."
Rollcall No. 158, "no."
Rollcall No. 159, "yea."
Rollcall No. 160, "yea."
Rollcall No. 161, "yea."
Rollcall No. 162, "yea."
Rollcall No. 163, "no."
Rollcall No. 164, "no."
Rollcall No. 165, "no."
Rollcall No. 166, "yea."
Rollcall No. 167, "yea."
Rollcall No. 168, "yea."
Rollcall No. 169, "yea."
Rollcall No. 170, "yea."
Rollcall No. 171, "yea."
Rollcall No. 172, "no."
Rollcall No. 173, "no."
Rollcall No. 174, "yea."

HOME WEATHERIZING PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been informed of the success of a unique home improvement program, Government funded, that is operating in Queens. I think the program should be adapted by all parts of the country, if similar programs are not already operating there, and I would like to share with the Members the information about what this program can do, as it was performed by two beautiful people.

Accordingly, I insert the following newsletter into the RECORD. The text of the newsletter is self-explanatory:

May 20, 1977.

Re: Home Weatherizing Program.

Mrs. EILEEN LEE,
Project Director, Operation Open City,
Jamaica, N.Y.

DEAR MRS. LEE: It is with enthusiasm and unconditional thanks upon having personally observed the maximum productivity and magnificent effectiveness regarding your Home-Weatherizing program.

About three months ago, we learned of the availability of your local operation through an announcement in our Community Planning Board 12's monthly newsletter; and immediately we were aware of one very special home (123-11 146th Street, South Ozone Park) owned by Miss Young and Miss Lyons, such house as of a year ago was a totally vandalized hulk of a wreckage before the same two ladies successfully purchased the house from HUD on an as-is bid; and the two ladies (75 years of age) through their own pioneering spirit and their own total equity-sweat (hammer, nails, paint brush, plumbers wrenches, cement hoes, etc.) did put that house together as liveable, and in effect started the first really genuine step to the housing rehabilitation of our community. . . . However, as with most Senior Citizens it was never their age that got in the way of their energy or ability, but the fact of the matter is that they are typically and unfairly striving with incredible imagination on the low fixed income social security which in no way follows anywhere close the continuing out-of-control inflationary economics of our times. And their home, like almost all of our homes whether new or old, was never built with fuel-crisis economics as critical objectives. Indeed the costs of "fuel-savings" reconditioning of any of our homes is almost as impossible as it is for affording the fuel bills; and with respect to most fixed income "Senior Citizens" without such programs as now administered by Operations Open City, none of us could really rest too much hope for a better day.

As it turned out, we advised the two ladies to contact your office for application to the Weatherizing program—and in the week of May 6th through May 13th, 1977, your marvelous team of energetic and skilled young men moved in to do one heck of an incredible job, the scope and thoroughness none of us could have guessed or imagined. In all too short praise, we do commend your program as vital, efficient, productive, compassionate and honest. We especially praise the actual men we so closely observed, Mr. Herbert Cosby, Field Manager, Mr. George Stallins, Tenant Service Coordinator and Mr. Milton Pratt, Deputy Manager, and Team Workers Mike Smith, Arthur Franklin, Arthur Cundy, Gregory Lee and Joseph Bryant.

We would wish that all government funded programs should be administered with as maximum effectiveness and compassion for which your service program has so exemplary demonstrated; it is to the spirit of such citizens as the two ladies Miss Young and Miss Lyons and to the spirit of such programs as Operation Open City which most nearly represents the only kinds of people and programs that can put our country back together again.

Sincerely,

J. R. SPILLER,
Communications Correspondent.

NEW JERSEY SLOVAK HERITAGE FESTIVAL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in one fashion or another, we, as Americans, are all immigrants. Aside from our priceless freedoms, perhaps the most cherished inheritance enjoyed by most of us is the culture and traditions of our ancestors.

In our Nation, which takes great pride in its diversity, it would indeed be tragic if we failed to appreciate the varied backgrounds from which we came.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure that I today salute Americans of Slovak descent who have set aside May 28 as an occasion dedicated to renewing the appreciation of their roots through the New Jersey Slovak Heritage Festival. Additionally, the festival is devoted to raising money for the Garden State Arts Center Cultural Fund which develops free programs for disabled veterans, senior citizens, school citizens, and the blind.

Mr. Speaker, the important and valuable contributions of those Slovak people who have chosen America as their home, are far too infrequently recognized.

From the arrival of Count Mauricus Augustus De Beniowsky in 1785, Slovaks have formed the backbone of industrial growth in various areas of the Nation. Particularly in the mines and mills Slovak Americans proved a major factor in building the vast steel industry so vital to American manufacturing.

But Slovak achievements are certainly not limited to the areas of technology and industry. The adult educational and recreations organizations called Sokols have served as models for similar programs among many other groups of new citizens. My home State of New Jersey is enriched by the presence of the headquarters of two of these worthwhile organizations—the Slovak Catholic Sokol and the Sokol Gymnastic Union Sokol of the U.S.A., both of which have numerous branches and are national in scope.

In the arts, especially in musically related fields, Slovaks have gained for themselves a prominent position. Further, in all fields of athletic endeavor but most particularly in gymnastic prowess, Slovaks have earned great renown.

Mr. Speaker, in summary I believe it would be difficult to surpass the simple eloquence of President Franklin D. Roosevelt who stated:

The country is mindful of the vast contribution the Slovaks have made to the cause of furthering the development and growth—moral, cultural and material. The stout hearted, clear minded, freedom loving and determined people of Slovakia, who... turned to America seeking a new home, now compose with their children and grandchildren an asset in the life industry and culture of this great land, that defies human power of appraisal.

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE DISABLED

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a compelling document that provides a framework and a set of goals for our legislative efforts to aid America's handicapped citizens in their struggle to enter the mainstream of our society. "A Bill of Rights for the Disabled" sets a standard for the Nation's policymakers, and I urge my colleagues to heed its message:

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE DISABLED

Whereas, the disabled in the United States, constituting a large minority with a commonality of needs and a unity of purpose, seek only to obtain for themselves what all Americans believe to be their birthright life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas, impediments and roadblocks of every nature are to be found at every hand, effectively preventing the fulfillment of life's promise for a large proportion of the disabled; and

Whereas, the American people, largely through lack of knowledge and misinformation have not as yet recognized the disabled as fellow human beings with a handicap to which all should make some accommodation, and who deserve equal opportunity as citizens; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the various States, counties and municipalities have not as yet, by legal means, made it possible for the disabled person to attain equal access to those benefits of life enjoyed by the able bodied, be it resolved;

Health 1. That all disabled persons be afforded the opportunity for full and comprehensive diagnostic, therapeutic, rehabilitative and follow-up services in the Nation's hospitals, clinics and rehabilitation centers without regard to race, religion, economic status, ethnic origin, sex, age or social condition.

Health 2. That all disabled persons requiring same be given and trained to use such orthotic, prosthetic or adaptive devices that will enable them to become more mobile and to live more comfortably.

Education 3. That all disabled persons be given every opportunity for formal education to the level of which they are capable and to the degree to which they aspire.

Employment 4. That all disabled persons, to the extent necessary, have the opportunity to receive special training commensurate with residual abilities in those aspects of life in which they are handicapped so that they may achieve the potential for entry into the labor market in competitive employment.

Employment 5. That all employable disabled persons, like other minorities, be covered by equal opportunity legislation so that equal productivity, potential and actual, receives equal consideration in terms of jobs,

promotions, salaries, workloads and fringe benefits.

Employment 6. That those disabled persons who because of the severity of their handicaps are deemed unable to enter the normal labor market be given the opportunity for special training and placement in limited work situations including sheltered work shops, home base employment and other protected job situations.

Employment 7. That a nationwide network of tax-supported sheltered workshops be created to offer limited work opportunities for all those severely disabled persons unable to enter the competitive labor market.

Housing 8. That nationwide and local programs of special housing for the disabled be established to permit the man opportunity to live in dignity and reasonable comfort.

Architectural Barriers-9. That federal state & local legislatures pass laws requiring the elimination of architectural barriers to buildings, recreational, cultural & social facilities & public places. Such legislation should include architectural standards for all new construction.

Architectural Barriers-10. That federal, state & local legislation be passed establishing standards & a reasonable time for modification of existing sidewalks, buildings & structures for the comfortable use of the handicapped.

Transportation-11. That every community, county or other legally constituted authority establish programs & standards for the creations of special transportation for the disabled including modification of existing mass transportation systems & the development of new specially designed demand schedule transportation facilities. Income Maintenance-12. That every disabled person who because of the nature of his handicap is unable to be self-supporting be given a guaranteed minimum income not below established federal standards adequate to live in reasonable comfort & in dignity.

Institutional Care-13. That federal, state & local laws be enacted for the benefit of the disabled confined to any form of institution, setting minimum standards of housing, conveniences, comfort, staff & services.

Civil Rights-14. That civil rights legislation, national & local, be amended to include disability as one of the categories against which discrimination is unlawful.

Training-15. That federal & state tax-supported programs of training be established to prepare professional & non-professional personnel for work with the handicapped in the fields of health, education, recreation & welfare.

Research-16. That federal legislation be enacted expanding existing & developing new programs of research & demonstration by grant & contract, in both basic & applied fields, dealing with problems of disabling conditions & the disabled.

Be it further resolved that these rights, being urgent & critical to the well being of the disabled population of the United States, be given the high priority they justly deserve in the hearts, minds & programs of our nation's leaders.

FIRST CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, though I am disappointed with the funding level contained in the conference report on the first concurrent budget res-

olution for national defense, I nevertheless supported it on the basis that half a loaf is better than none at all.

I believe the present military balance vis-a-vis the U.S.S.R. demands a great deal more concern with the condition of our own military and that this is not the time to attempt to build our own national defense system on the cheap.

In the future, it may not be necessary for us to concern ourselves so with our national security. But this is not the reality of the present. Trying to achieve financial restraint at the expense of self-protection is in my opinion a reckless course to follow.

MUZZLE ON THE MILITARY?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, during the early years of then President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara, we went through another period of "muzzling the military" and in my view, it cost us dearly. Specifically, policies were put into operation that started us on the downhill slide that cost us not only Vietnam, but also our No. 1 military position in the world. Today, another such period appears to be upon us. As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I attended the session of the Subcommittee on Investigations yesterday, chaired by Congressman STRATTON and I found what General Singlaub had to say in support of his position to be very significant and persuasive. His evidence was formidable and was presented in a very factual manner. Therefore, it is my feeling that the Carter administration serves the Nation poorly if it permits dissent only from such as Secretary of Labor Marshall and U.N. Ambassador Young.

In this connection, please see my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24, 1977, page 16222. As columnists Evans and Novak recently pointed out, the military is not even being consulted on key decisions. The column appeared in the Washington Post of May 25, 1977, and with the exception of their statement on General McArthur with which I disagree, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A MUZZLE ON THE MILITARY?

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just as President Carter was publicly rebuking Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, resentment among senior military officers was given a stronger impetus when the Joint Chiefs of Staff belatedly learned about the latest proposal for the strategic arms limitation talks.

The JCS was briefed only last week on the new U.S. arms-control plan some two weeks after it was submitted to the Russians. The new proposals embrace basic questions of U.S. military strength, including retarded development of the cruise missile. That has generated rising resentment among senior officers that reaches into the JCS itself.

This is similar to both the cause and the underlying meaning of the Singlaub affair.

His out-of-order public criticism of troop withdrawals from Korea reflected widespread frustration among the generals for not having been consulted in shaping that policy. So, in both Korea and SALT, the military's complaint is not so much that it disagrees with a policy but that it is ignored in policy formation.

Herein lies an unhealthy situation not fully comprehended at the White House. While nobody questions civilian supremacy, senior officers grumble that they are given no chance to submit their views but are simply handed a completed policy—along with a muzzle.

Oddly, JCS Chairman George Brown plays no part in this simmering revolt. Kept at his post by sufferance of President Ford and now Carter after his string of indiscreet public remarks, Brown wants to serve out his term without further trouble. But other senior officers, including members of the chiefs, want a greater policy voice. Gen. Bernard Rogers, Army Chief of Staff, has pushed particularly hard for a military role in SALT policy-making.

The Army is at the center of Pentagon discontent mainly because of concern with Korea. When Carter entered office, he did not ask the Pentagon's advice on whether to remove troops from South Korea but merely requested their comments on the best way to do it (as he did on his plan for drastic mutual reduction in long-range missiles).

The troop withdrawal had been decided on by Carter long before he became President. Admittedly a novice in foreign affairs, candidate Carter based his decision more on the imperatives of presidential politics than any exhaustive study of the Korean situation.

Singlaub's view stated to The Washington Post that Carter's Korean policy will lead to war is nearly universally shared by other U.S. generals, as well as many of the most politically sensitive Japanese. Since the understrength U.S. 2nd Infantry Division is obviously not a significant military factor, the question is whether its departure, along with U.S. support troops, will be interpreted by Communist North Korea as an invitation to attack. While the debate clearly has two sides, the generals resent not having a chance to argue their case.

That resentment was intensified by the President's ordering Singlaub to the Oval Office. Old hands in Washington were amazed that the President had chosen public humiliation of a distinguished officer when a quiet reprimand and transfer would have sufficed.

To some officers, it appeared Carter was seeking to emulate Harry Truman's historic sacking of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. But MacArthur was a major political figure who repeatedly defied his President; Singlaub is a subordinate (third-ranking officer in Korea) guilty of one indiscreet interview. Actually, senior officers are even more concerned about the sudden exclusion of the military from SALT policymaking. While the Pentagon helped prepare Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's negotiating position in Moscow, it had no part in devising the new, softer stand in Geneva.

The possibility of a pattern here is suggested by the downgrading of military intelligence units, putting the CIA in a monopolistic status. While deprived of a full advisory voice before positions are taken, the officers are barred by the Constitution from commenting afterwards—as John Singlaub has learned.

The gagged condition of the military contrasts starkly with the rest of the open-mouthed administration, most conspicuously Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall criticizing the President's economic policies and U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young saying whatever comes to his mind. At a time of U.S. military decline in relation to the Soviet Union,

this anomaly breeds angry frustration among the military.

ON THE OPPOSITION TO EXPANSION OF REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a group of citizens from Humboldt County, Calif., were here in Washington to express their opposition to legislation introduced by my colleague PHIL BURTON which would expand Redwood National Park. I respect their right to tell the Congress and the country how they feel about this legislation, and I also want them to know we are not ignoring their concerns.

Early this Congress, the Government Operations Committee issued a report titled "Protecting Redwood National Park." The report outlines the arguments in favor of expansion of the park; I do not intend to repeat them here. Included in that report is a chapter which discusses the impact of park expansion on the local economy. The report recommends that—

Congress should consider and assess the impact on the economy of Humboldt County of any legislation expanding Redwood National Park.

The report also urges that—

Congress and the Administration work closely with the State of California to determine what legislative and executive action is needed . . . to offset the expected initial and interim loss of jobs and revenue to Humboldt County.

I am happy to report today that both Congress and the Carter administration are working to insure that the purchase of old-growth redwood timber for additional parkland will not cause any significant increase in Humboldt County unemployment. In fact, our studies lead us to believe that better forest management practices by the timber companies could even increase employment in the area. The administration has also promised to spend Federal money to create alternative jobs for displaced timber industry workers. Representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Labor, and Commerce have already begun an onsite assessment of the job impact of park expansion. I am aware that Representative BURTON is working on an addition to his bill to deal with job losses, and I applaud his efforts.

No, the citizens of Humboldt County, Calif., are not being ignored in the Redwood Park legislation. Their legitimate and understandable concern about the efforts of park expansion on their lives is being heard and responded to.

I want to make it very clear that my support of expansion of Redwood Park has not diminished one bit. As we stand here today, groves of magnificent redwoods in the Redwood Creek basin are being eradicated by the lumber companies. Some of the very best quality

redwood timber is scheduled to be clear-cut in the next 90 days.

Interior Secretary Andrus is currently developing a strategy for purchasing a portion of the beautiful Skunk Cabbage Creek area along U.S. 101, partly with money donated to the Federal Government by the Save the Redwoods League. Both the Secretary and the league are to be commended for their efforts to stop the Arcata Redwood chainsaw from destroying this magnificent watershed.

Frankly, I am amazed that there would be any question of national support for purchase of enough land to give the absolute minimum protection to those coastal redwoods that are the tallest trees in the world. Nine years ago we bought those trees in order to save them. Now we find that the purpose of that action has been endangered because we did not provide enough land to save the tall trees from being destroyed by natural forces: water, erosion, and wind.

These redwoods are surely as much a part of our national heritage as are the crown jewels of Britain in the Tower of London. Would the British accept the argument that their beleaguered financial condition requires that they sell off their jewels? Surely not.

Certainly we must not use the argument that we cannot afford the limited funds needed to save our own national crown jewels. And our tall trees are presently far more fragile and in far greater danger than the stones in the British crowns.

I believe it is about time for Congress to act positively and forthrightly to save the redwoods—which is a national concern—while the livelihood of Humboldt County and its citizens is also protected.

UNITED STATES MAY SEIZE KEY PARCEL OF REDWOODS

(By Robert A. Jones)

U.S. Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus has approved "in concept" a plan to seize a key redwood parcel next to Redwood National Park before the old-growth trees can be cut down by the lumber company that owns the land, Interior officials said Friday.

The plan would employ condemnation powers granted the secretary under the 1968 law creating the park. It was developed in a frenetic series of meetings after a \$1 million offer by the Save-the-Redwoods League to pay for the land.

The offer, previously unannounced, was made by the league earlier this week.

In announcing its offer on Friday, the league said, "While Congress is considering an expansion of Redwood National Park . . . the major lumber companies of Northern California are continuing to log the finest remaining old-growth redwoods which adjoin and should be included within the present park. It is now a literal race between the lumber companies' chain saws and the Congress."

Interior officials cautioned that problems of procedure and additional financing remained to be solved before the plan could be put into effect. "The will is there," said one official. "But it may be next Wednesday before we are ready to move."

The action would be unprecedented in the tumultuous history of Redwood National Park. In part it reflects the urgency of the Interior Department as it tries to preserve remaining stands of old-growth timber until Congress votes on proposals to expand the 58,000-acre park north of Eureka.

Congress currently is considering two plans for park expansion, one that would add 48,000 acres and another that would add 74,000. The area under consideration by the Interior Department, known as Skunk Cabbage Creek, is included in both expansion plans.

Last week the California Board of Forestry approved a partial moratorium around the park, preventing companies from cutting three sections next to the park's southern portion. The moratorium, however, does not apply to the parcels in Skunk Cabbage Creek since the timber company involved, Arcata Redwood Co., already has received permits to begin harvesting.

The area has long been regarded by both environmentalists and the National Park Service as critical to any expansion of the present park. Arcata, however, has said in recent weeks that it plans to begin harvesting there soon.

Only one-third of the Skunk Cabbage Creek watershed remains in old growth. But maturing second-growth stands cover the remaining areas and in its expansion proposal the National Park Service said the watershed "will provide an unbroken park from the Pacific Ocean to the first major ridge" in the coastal mountains.

The condemnation procedure would secure only the two small areas within the watershed that are planned for harvesting, Interior officials said. If logged, the clear cuts would be visible from U.S. 101.

In fact, the visibility of the cuts from 101 proved to be critical, for the powers granted to the interior secretary under the original park legislation include the authority "to acquire . . . lands and interest in lands . . . to maintain or to restore a screen of trees between the highway and the land behind the screen."

The purpose of such a screen is to hide the scars of logging from passersby on the highway.

While Interior Department officials expressed the fear that Arcata, once notified of the plan, would hasten its logging operations, an Arcata official said late Friday that such action was "unlikely."

William Walsh, executive vice president of Arcata, said the plan was "just part of a total effort to take our property from us until it becomes impossible for us to continue."

Nonetheless, Walsh said, "We can't change our scheduling to react to every threat like this. It is not that easy to do." Walsh noted that the timber permits would have allowed the company to begin harvesting on April 1. "And you didn't see us marching in there on April 2," he said.

Interior officials said extra financing for the plan was the thorniest problem remaining. Agency estimates put the total value of the land at \$1.6 to \$2 million. "Even with the league's money, that means we have to come up with the rest from somewhere," said one official.

The agency was known to be looking for additional funds within its own budget and from other private donors.

BETTER HEARING AND SPEECH MONTH

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, May is Better Hearing and Speech Month. One out of every 10 Americans has a speech, hearing, or language problem and cannot communicate easily, and so it is important that we be aware of the efforts in

our communities to deal with these problems. A great many people and institutions are involved in these programs throughout the Nation. The American Speech and Hearing Association is the national scientific and professional society of more than 25,000 speech pathologists and audiologists who are carrying out the work of improving the speech and hearing of those affected. The association earlier this year published in Newsweek magazine a message to Americans about the problems, needs, and opportunities in this area, and I enter it in the RECORD for the information of our colleagues:

HUMAN COMMUNICATION IS ESSENTIAL TO LIFE

More than 20 million Americans have some form of speech, language or hearing disorder. Six out of every one hundred children have such a disorder. One out of every four people who are sixty-five or older has a hearing loss. The ability to develop speech and language skills and to exchange ideas verbally is unique to human beings. Communication is the binding force in every human culture and the dominant influence in the personal life of every one of us.

Speech pathologists and audiologists are the professionals who identify, evaluate and provide help for communicative handicaps in individuals. Speech pathologists study speech and language, its normal development and its disorders. Audiologists specialize in hearing problems and are concerned with the detection, evaluation, and alleviation of hearing loss.

Professional help for persons with communication disorders is available in a variety of settings throughout the country. In schools. In clinics and hospitals. In community health centers. In private practice. In colleges and universities. In business and industry. In local, state and national governmental agencies.

If you, or someone you care about, has a communication problem, seek the help of a speech pathologist or audiologist in your community. Your local school district or health department can assist you in locating one. Or write to the American Speech and Hearing Association, 9030 Old Georgetown Road, Washington, D.C. 20014.

For half a century, helping the communicatively handicapped achieve a meaningful life, through science and service.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN INSPECTION OF IMPORTED MEAT AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which establishes stronger inspection standards for imported meat and dairy products and requires these products to be labeled as imported. This measure will be fair to producers and beneficial to consumers.

The American consumer deserves and demands a sanitary, wholesome, and pure food supply. The consumers who are wary of the conditions surrounding the production, processing or distribution of imported meats should certainly have the right to know whether the product they are buying is domestic or imported. Only

then can the customer be assured of a true choice between products in the marketplace. The labeling provisions of this bill would help bridge this inequity.

Throughout the 1970's, American consumers have demanded higher quality produce in our Nation's grocery stores. U.S. milk, meat, fresh fruits and vegetables, and cheese are produced and processed under the most stringent sanitary standards. Unfortunately, such is not the case in many foreign countries. The Food and Drug Administration, FDA, presently inspects less than 20 percent of all foreign dairy products entering the United States, yet 4 to 10 percent of the products inspected are rejected because they contain pesticides, salmonella, or some other contaminant. If we enact this legislation, we subject foreign manufacturers to the same scrutiny as domestic producers.

Agriculture is one of the Nation's largest businesses. Today, the American farmer produces enough to feed himself and 57 others, compared to being able to feed 15 people 25 years ago. The National Milk Producers Federation has recently completed a breakdown of milk production by congressional districts on the basis of information in the 1974 Census of Agriculture. This report revealed that milk producers in the State of Missouri produced over 2.5 billion pounds of milk with the dairymen of the Eighth District of Missouri producing over 339 million pounds of milk. While the numbers of farmers working the land are few, all of agriculture and rural America comprise 30 percent of the population of the United States. The agricultural industry, with so few people working directly on farms, is the most vital industry in our Nation, affecting every individual citizen.

I urge my colleagues from the cities and farm areas to support this bill to improve the wholesomeness of the food we eat and to restore equity between our inspection standards for our domestic and foreign meat and dairy products.

Following is the text of the bill:

H.R. —

A bill to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be subjected to certain tests and that such meat or products be identified as having been imported; to require the inspection of imported dairy products and that such products comply with certain minimum standards of sanitation; to require that the cost of conducting such tests, inspections, and identification procedures on imported meat and meat food products and on dairy products, as the case may be, be borne by the exporters of such articles, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Sec. 101. Section 20(a) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620(a)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The Secretary shall, with respect to any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of a cow, sheep, swine, goat, horse, mule, or other equine which is capable of use as human food and which is imported into the United States, require by regulation or otherwise that any such article or any

product made in whole or in part from any such article, if capable for use as human food, or that the package or container of such article or product, be labeled or otherwise marked in such manner as the Secretary determines practicable to inform the retail consumer of such article or product at the time of purchase that such article or product was imported, in whole or in part, as the case may be, into the United States.

"(3) No carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines which are capable of use as human food shall be imported into the United States unless—

"(A) tests have been conducted on the carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat and meat food products, including internal organs, of the animals from which such articles came, to determine whether such articles (i) contain any substance prohibited in any carcass or meat or meat food product from any domestically produced animal referred to above, and (ii) contain a level of any substance in excess of the maximum level of such substance permitted under law or regulation in any carcass or meat food product from any domestically produced animal referred to above;

"(B) such tests have been conducted, in the country from which such articles are being imported, by persons who have been initially certified (and subsequently recertified) in the same or similar manner and under the same criteria as persons who are initially certified (and subsequently recertified) by the Department of Agriculture to conduct such tests on articles of animals produced in the United States; and

"(C) the appropriate government official of the country from which any such article is being imported has certified to the Secretary that such article has been tested in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary and that such article does not contain any substance referred to in subparagraph (A) or contain a level of any substance in excess of the maximum level referred to in such subparagraph, as appropriate.

"(4) In order to verify the accuracy of testing required for substances referred to in paragraph (5), the Secretary shall conduct a program under which inspectors of the Department of Agriculture take, from time to time, samples of carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat and meat food products of animals referred to in paragraph (5) which are intended for export to the United States, including the internal organs of the animals from which such carcasses and meat and meat food products came, and send such samples to the United States for appropriate testing.

"(5) As used in paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection, the term 'substance' means any chemical matter for which the Department of Agriculture conducts tests on carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat and meat food products, including the internal organs, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines which are capable of use as human food, for the purpose of determining whether residues of such chemical matter are present in such articles or to determine whether the residues of such chemical matter present in such articles exceeds levels authorized by law or regulation.

"(6) (A) The Secretary shall prescribe such assessments and fees on imported meat and meat food products as he determines necessary to cover the costs of inspections, certifications, testing, and labeling (or other marking) required under this section.

"(B) In establishing the level or rate of assessments and fees to be imposed under this title, the Secretary shall take into consideration the volume of exports, the value thereof, and such other factors as he deems appropriate in order to achieve a fair and equitable allocation of such assessments and fees among exporters.

"(C) The Secretary shall have authority to suspend or revoke the privilege of any exporter of meat or meat food products to export such products to the United States if such exporter fails to pay the assessments or fees for which he is responsible to pay under this title."

TITLE II—DAIRY PRODUCTS

Sec. 201. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(3) The terms "dairy products" and "milk products" mean those food products derived from milk, or any combination or portion thereof; such as all forms of butter, cheese (whether natural or processed), milk, cream, skim milk, whey, buttermilk, edible casein, caseinates and frozen desserts; and any other food product which is prepared in whole or in part from any of the aforesaid products as the Secretary may hereafter designate.

(4) The term "wholesome" means sound, healthful, clean, and otherwise fit for human food.

(5) The term "labeling" means labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter on or attached to the container of any dairy product.

(6) The term "purity" means free from poisonous or deleterious substances which may render the product injurious to health.

(7) The term "administration and supervision" means the administrative review of foreign country laws, regulations, and enforcement procedures offered as being comparable to United States laws, regulations, and enforcement procedures, under the provisions of this title, and the supervision of inspection personnel both inside and outside the United States.

(8) The term "inspection" means the official service rendered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the administration and supervision of the Secretary, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title.

Sec. 202. (a) No dairy product shall be imported into the United States unless the Secretary shall first certify that such product originated from supplies of milk which are pure and wholesome and unless the plants in which such products were produced, manufactured, or processed comply with all minimum standards of sanitation prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this title. The standards prescribed by the Secretary shall include standards for sanitation procedures in the production, cooling, storage, transportation, and handling of milk, and in the manufacture, processing, handling, and transit of dairy products, as well as standards concerning the wholesomeness and purity of the final product.

(b) The standards established by the Secretary for any imported dairy product and for the establishments in which such imported dairy product is produced, manufactured, or processed shall be comparable to those standards of purity, wholesomeness, and sanitation recommended by the Secretary for domestic dairy products produced, manufactured, or processed in the United States and for establishments in the United States in which domestic dairy products are produced, manufactured, or processed.

Sec. 203. (a) For the purpose of establishing comparable inspection requirements and preventing the importation of dairy products produced, manufactured, or processed in foreign plants not meeting the minimum standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall, where and to the extent necessary, cause to be inspected imported dairy products and require such products to be accompanied by a certificate of compliance issued by the Secretary in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the

Secretary establishing minimum standards as to the sanitation of the milk, plant facilities, equipment, and procedures used in the production and transportation of milk, and the manufacture, processing, handling, and transit of such imported dairy products.

(b) All imported dairy products shall, after entry into the United States, be subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Sec. 204. The Secretary shall require all dairy products imported into the United States, or the packages or container of such products, to be labeled or otherwise marked in such manner as he determines practicable to inform the retail consumer of such products at the time of purchase that such products were imported, in whole or in part, as the case may be, into the United States.

Sec. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary may cooperate with foreign governments, other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and with appropriate State agencies, and may conduct such examinations, investigations, and inspections as he determines necessary or appropriate through any officer or employee of the United States, of any State, or of any foreign government, who is licensed by the Secretary for such purpose.

Sec. 206. The provisions of this title shall be in addition to the requirements of all other laws relating to imports of dairy products.

Sec. 207. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe such assessments and fees on imported dairy products as he determines necessary to cover the cost of inspections, certifications, and labeling (or other marking) required under the provisions of this title.

(b) In establishing the level or rate of assessments or fees to be imposed under this title, the Secretary shall take into consideration, in the case of any exporter, the annual volume of exports, the value thereof, and such other factors as he deems appropriate in order to achieve a fair and equitable allocation of such assessments and fees among exporters.

(c) The Secretary shall have authority to suspend or revoke the privilege of any exporter of dairy products to export such products to the United States if such exporter fails to pay the assessments or fees for which he is responsible under this title.

Sec. 208. The cost of administering and supervising the provisions of this title shall be borne by the United States.

Sec. 209. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the administration and supervision of the provisions of this title.

Sec. 210. If any provisions of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

ADDRESS OF JAMES RESTON,
MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OXFORD,
OHIO, MAY 15, 1977

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1977, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, delivered the principal address on the occasion of commencement exercises

at Miami University, in Oxford, Ohio. I ask that Mr. Reston's comments, a perceptive appraisal of the world facing American college graduates of 1977, be placed at this point in the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, MIAMI UNIVERSITY,
MAY 15, 1977

(By James Reston)

Mr. President, members of the Class of '77, ladies and gentlemen: To begin, I congratulate the parents of the Class of '77. Raising a family in these last twenty years cannot have been one long picnic. Also, I think it was very clever of the Old Folks to arrange things so that their children got out of college in 1977, for this is really the first year in an entire generation when the nation is at peace. This graduating class may have a little trouble getting the jobs they want, and if Jimmy Carter has his way, you may have to drive smaller cars and live in houses that are not boiling in winter and freezing in summer, but on the whole, this is not a bad time to be young and alive, particularly when you consider the alternatives.

Commencement is an old-fashioned tradition. It was based on the theory, not always supported these days, that after graduation, you were supposed to Commence—that is to say, to get along, and get off the old man's back. On your way out, you were expected to listen to some elderly type, telling you that you are the smartest bunch of students in the history of the Republic, and that the rest of us just can't wait to step aside and let you take over.

Well, I have news for you: This is rubbish. We are not eager to step aside. We're going to stick around until you elbow us out of the way. The first lesson of post-graduate life is that you have to spend a lot of time in your Twenties and Thirties listening to eminent bores, and Commencement addresses are just the first lesson in this tedious discipline.

A CALMER FUTURE

I want to say a few words about luck, for by the accident of history, my guess is that you are going to have a better chance to arrange your private lives in the last quarter of this century than your parents and grandparents had in the previous three quarters. In the first quarter, we had the first World War, which was really a kind of Civil War within the Western World. In the second quarter, we had a second World War and a world-wide economic depression that destroyed the old Empires and established the power of the Communist nations over most of Continental Europe and Continental Asia. In the Third Quarter, we had the Korean and Vietnam wars that divided and corrupted our country, and led to the retirement of one President and the banishment of another.

I will spare you a history lecture. My point is simply that these events tore up lives of men and women and their families, whose dreams, I can assure you, were as noble and ardent as your own. They had to grapple with Hitler, the military draft, and declarations of war. You have to deal with freedom, with Jimmy Carter, William James and "the moral equivalent of war." It won't be easy, but comparatively, it's not a bad deal.

It all depends, I suppose, on how you approach personal life, family and friendship and the life of the nation. When he came to the end of his life, G. K. Chesterton asked himself what he had learned. He thought everything depended on whether you took the miracle of life, with all its wonders and perplexities—whether you took it for granted or regarded it with gratitude. Everything, he concluded, depended on your approach, your assumptions, what you expected.

Many years ago, Judge Bettman of Cincinnati told me a story about this University that illustrates my point. A farmer, I think in

Hamilton County, sent his daughter to Miami University, and turned her over to the brilliant minds of the faculty and the tender mercies of the Administration, who in their wisdom promptly flunked her out.

This is not some Old Folks' tale. You can look it up in the legal records. The Old Gentleman took the case to court—all the way to the Ohio Supreme Court. The State argued that she just wasn't smart enough to make it. Her father argued that he knew she wasn't smart, but that he had paid his taxes, this was a state university, and therefore it was the duty of the State to make her smart. I suppose his approach to the problem was wrong, but I was a "C" student at the University of Illinois myself, and I always wondered sympathetically what happened to that girl. For all I know she's working for Jimmy Carter, whose staff is full of brilliant academic failures.

AN OPTIMISTIC OUTLOOK

What kind of a world are you going into? This no doubt is what you'd like to know. I am a reporter and not a prophet, but I believe we can see certain trends or tendencies that are bound to influence your lives and which, on the whole, are more optimistic than the popular pessimism of the time would allow.

In practical terms, I have mentioned the likelihood of general peace. There will be uprisings and rebellions, tribal wars in Africa, maybe even terrible racial but limited wars in the South of that turbulent continent; certainly great tension in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab nations; and much confusion over how to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes without losing control over the expansion of nuclear military weapons. But there is a new balance of power or terror in the world and the prospects for avoiding a major world war between your age and mine (which is quite a distance) are pretty good.

Second, the job market is not all that bad. Vice President Henry Wallace was condemned as an impractical dreamer when he talked in the Thirties about the possibility of creating "60 million jobs in America." Last week the Department of Labor announced that we had exceeded 90 million jobs for the first time in our history.

Third, the Class of '77, I believe, is graduating at a much healthier time than the graduates of the Sixties and the first half of the Seventies.

The divisions between the races in America, between the rich and the poor, between the generations, between management and labor, between the major political parties, and between the North and South are far less pronounced.

The extremists of the left and right have not been able to impose their will on the nation. Mr. Lincoln said "as our problems are new, we must think anew," and I believe the process of self-examination, of reappraisal, and even of reform has set in.

TIME OF MODERATION

Our problems are so new and complicated at home and abroad that no ideology has been able to deal with them—not the Welfare state ideology of George McGovern out of Dakota or the conservative ideology of the Tafts in Hamilton County, or the Fabian Socialists in Britain, or the Communists in Moscow and Peking. All the lovely ideological theories have been murdered by the brutal facts of modern life. So there is, I think, a new spirit of moderation coming to the fore in this country, and even, in a vague and fugitive way, in the other advanced nations of the world.

On a more personal level—perhaps more relevant to this year's graduates—I believe this same process of reappraisal is going on, with hopeful but not yet definite results. All the relationships of American life are under review—in the university between faculty

and students; in the church, between ministers, priests, rabbis and their parishioners; in the family between parents and children; in business between manager and workers and everywhere in the relations between men and women.

I have the impression, for example, that the worst of the drug culture has passed, at least for university students, that they have looked over the edge of that steep precipice and don't like what they have seen, and have begun to pull back. In the Victorian Age, we had love without sex and in the Modern Age, we have had sex without love, and I gather that lately a lot of people have been wondering whether the Age of Freedom produced even more problems than the Age of Repression. I'm not an expert of this subject, but I gather there's a difference between fun and happiness.

NEW EMPHASIS ON VALUES

In any event, if you look around these days, you will find that there is a revival of discussion on ethics and values. The Congress is putting down new ethical rules for its members, and passing new laws about the financing of political campaigns. Big Corporations, caught in illegal political contributions at home and bribery for contract abroad, are establishing new codes of business conduct. After Watergate, the law schools are wondering how Ehrlichman and Mitchell and all those legal eagles went wrong, and even that most self-righteous institution in the land, The Press, is beginning to police itself.

The President of Harvard University, Derek Bok, illustrated this rising concern with ethical values at Brown University in Providence the other day.

"More attention is being given today," he said, "to developing problem-oriented courses in ethics. These classes are built around a series of contemporary moral dilemmas. They may take any one of several forms. Some may emphasize issues of deception, breach of promise. . . ."

"Thus, premedical students can grapple with issues of abortion, euthanasia and human experimentation, while students interested in public service may discuss whether government officials are ever justified in lying to the public, or leaking confidential information, or refusing to carry out the orders of their superiors. . . ."

I find this very interesting, for he was talking very much like the Presidents of the little church-oriented colleges of 100 years ago in Ohio—from Oberlin and Ohio Wesleyan to Wittenberg, and responding, I think, to some yearning in our people who may no longer believe in the old values but still believe in believing.

This University was founded by an odd collection of Scotch and English preachers and editors—the Rev. John W. Browne, Robert Owen, a wandering Scottish school master and many others—and if you read their early sermons, you will understand the danger of inviting another Presbyterian to address you here on a Sunday morning, but I will be brief.

TOO MANY CHOICES?

The one thing that may be very hard on the Class of '77 is that its members have so much freedom. This has removed many barriers and silly taboos, and provided many advantages.

There is less loneliness in America. The generosity of young people today, their willingness to share what they have is beautiful. On the whole, personnel relations have become more gentle, but as Huxley observed many years ago, "a man's worst difficulties begin when he is able to do as he likes."

I have been watching and reporting on the revolution in American manners, customs, and particularly the attitudes toward sex, work, the family, the church, etc., for quite

a long time, and I would like to be able to say that I thought the New Freedom had made the graduates of the Fifties and Sixties happier than we were in the Thirties, I want to believe this is true but I can't.

Walter Lippman defines the problem better than I can. The prisoners of the puritan age have been released, he noted. They ought to be serene and composed. They are free to make their own lives. There are no conventions, no taboos, no gods, priests, princes, fathers, or revelations which they must accept.

Yet, he added, the result is not as good as they thought it would be. There is no moral authority to which the liberated young people must turn, but there is the coercion of opinions, fashions, and fads, and some, joining or inventing new creeds and cults, "put on manacles to keep their hands from trembling."

"What most distinguished the generation who have approached maturity since the debacle of idealism," Lippman concluded, "is not their rebellion against the religion and moral code of their parents, but their disillusionment with their own rebellion. It is common for young men and women to rebel, but that they should rebel sadly and without faith in their own rebellion, that they should distrust the New Freedom no less than the old certainties—that is something of a novelty."

If it is any consolation to this year's graduates, I should note that this was Lippman talking, not about your generation but about mine in "A Preface to Morals", but what was beginning to be true in the Thirties is I think, much more moral dilemma in the Seventies.

RANDOM THOUGHTS

I have nothing but a few random thoughts about the moral insecurity of the present age: The first is that personal license or self-gratification may be a self-limiting disease. For if it is true—as I believe—that the sexual and drug experiments of the Fifties and Sixties did not lead to a more satisfactory life but to frustration and middle-aged confusion and boredom, then the chances are that the graduates of the Seventies will begin to wonder and even to search for more enduring answers to the human problem.

Second, if the cynicism of the present age is justified—which I don't believe—and you find nothing good in the church, the government, the press, and the other modern institutions, then it seems to me your best hope lies in personal friendship, in faithful love, and in the integrity of the family.

I must say in passing that "the bitch-Goddess Success" is no sure answer either. A newspaper reporter spends a good deal of his time with successful or at least notorious people—I have been watching them in Washington for 36 years—and in my experience there is no inevitable relationship between success and happiness. Anybody who has watched Richard Nixon on the television these last couple of weeks will understand what I mean.

Third, it is not true in my experience—to quote that eminent philosopher Leo Durocher—that "nice guys finish last." Many scoundrels succeed—they are on the front pages every day, often under indictment—but in the generality of things, simple honesty, reliability, and hard work are still rewarded in this country. The cruelest book that I could write—and never will—would deal with the failure of success—and particularly what happened to the children of the people who put success in politics, business, or the press ahead of the family and everything else.

Finally, I think it's a little silly to believe, as so many do now, in the end of the American frontier, that the challenges before this generation are less exciting than

when the Old Folks cleared the Plains or when the Ohio General Assembly on February 6, 1810 directed the trustees of this founding institution to "lay out a town to be called Oxford and create a college township without a road leading to it."

Our frontier is now the world, and its main hope of creating a decent life for the human family lies as usual right here in America. We are just beginning to realize that for the first time in history, we have a world economy in which each nation's actions affect the lives of all other nations—if the two world wars and Vietnam didn't convince you, look at the price of gas or coffee. This year's college graduates will be just about 45 years of age at the end of the Century—at that point in life when you have just enough experience and energy to be needed and to be helpful, which in my view, is the key to what the Founding Fathers called "the pursuit of happiness."

Sometimes you have to be personal to be understood, so I will end on a personal note. This was the first University I ever saw. I bummed down on the pike when I was in high school in Dayton to see a basketball game. I forget whether you won—you usually do—but many years later when I went as a reporter to that other Oxford, where the British were educating the elite, I came to understand the genius of the American Land Grant colleges, which started in Mr. Lincoln's time at my own University in Urbana, Illinois, and insisted that education was not for the elite but for anybody's children who wanted to dream of a larger life.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I congratulate you, and the faculty, and the Members of the Class of '77. I hope they keep on dreaming, for this is not the end of anything for them or for America. The magic is still here. It is a beginning, a Commencement, and as I see it, the frontier is wider than ever, and very bright.

GENERAL SINGLAUB CITES WIDE OBJECTION TO U.S. PULLOUT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a major point brought out in General Singlaub's testimony yesterday before the Subcommittee on Investigation of the House Armed Services Committee was the fact that the Armed Forces of North Korea and South Korea are not evenly matched as some so-called experts have led us to believe. Thus, the withdrawal of the American forces will not only be a psychological blow to the free world, it will also tip the military balance further in Communist North Korea's favor. General Singlaub, whatever his future assignment will be, has again served his country well by bringing these facts to light so that if President Carter persists in his policy and war ensues, he will have been forewarned as well as the American public. The story from the Washington Star of May 25, 1977, follows:

SINGLAUB CITES WIDE OBJECTIONS TO U.S. PULLOUT

(By Vernon A. Guidry, Jr.)

Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub said today that that no American officer in a responsible position in South Korea agrees with the Carter administration's plan to withdraw all U.S. ground troops there.

Singlaub testified before the House Armed Services subcommittee on investigations. He repeated his own estimate that withdrawal would mean war with North Korea.

(In Seoul, President Carter's two special envoys, Philip C. Habib and Gen. George S. Brown, today told President Park Chung Hee of plans to withdraw 33,000 American troops from Korea in four to five years, the Associated Press reported.)

(Park did not welcome the plan, but agreed to accept it as America's "established policy," an aide said. He said Park asked for U.S. help in strengthening South Korea's military.)

Singlaub, who was fired from his job as chief of staff of U.S. forces in Korea by President Carter and recalled to this country, said it was the opinion of senior officers of the South Korean armed forces that withdrawal of the U.S. ground troops would mean "flat-out, clearly, unequivocally" that North Korea would attack.

Singlaub said that on purely military grounds "I agree with that." The general said that it also was his impression that senior U.S. civilian officials also believed the withdrawal of American ground forces to be a mistake.

Subcommittee Chairman Samuel S. Stratton, D-N.Y., asked Singlaub if the "overwhelming majority" of official Americans in Korea opposed withdrawal.

"That is absolutely correct," he replied. What then was the reason for the withdrawal, Stratton wanted to know.

Singlaub said the Korean command wanted to know that, too.

The general continued that requests from the Korean command for a rationale for the withdrawal had brought no response, including a query directed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Singlaub did not accept the proposition that the balance of forces between North and South Korea would permit withdrawal. He said there was "a clear military superiority of the North over the South" that would only be worsened by withdrawal of U.S. ground troops.

The general was fired from his post after an interview in which he expressed similar views was published in the Washington Post. Today he said he had thought his remarks to a reporter were "on background," a phrase that indicates the information may be printed but not attributed to the speaker by name.

"I realize that some will believe that regardless of whether I thought that my remarks were for non-attribution my aim was still the same—to take issue with our country's stated national security policy. However, I can state categorically that such was not my intent," the general said.

He said that as a professional military officer he supports the administration's policy. His contrary testimony was prompted under a convention of congressional testimony spelled out by Stratton. That permits committee members to solicit the personal views of military men after they have testified in favor of whatever it is their bosses want to do.

FIRST GLOBAL EXPERIMENT OF THE GLOBAL ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times contains an excellent review by Walter Sul-

livan of the major climatic research experiment soon to be undertaken jointly by the World Meteorological Organization and the International Council of Scientific Unions. This first global experiment of the global atmospheric research program, which will begin in September, is the kind of concentrated, cooperative effort which this country increasingly needs to support if we are to better understand climatic variations and the effects of climate on human activities.

As you know, H.R. 6669, the National Climate Program Act of 1977, which was reported May 6 to the House by the Science and Technology Committee, establishes a national, multi-agency program to finally address climate-related questions in an integrated way. I believe our participation in the first GARP global experiment would be facilitated if the Climate Program Office outlined by this legislation were already in place. I hope we of the Congress can move quickly to provide this stronger framework for our participation in these international climate research and monitoring efforts.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1977]
WORLD STUDY SEEKS TO LEARN WEATHER FORECASTING LIMITS
(By Walter Sullivan)

GENEVA, May 20.—To test the intrinsic limits on weather forecasting and lay the basis for an understanding of climate change, one of the most extensive international scientific experiments in history is being organized.

The tools will include American, European, Japanese and Soviet earth satellites, some 50 research ships, hundreds of balloons adrift in the high atmosphere and buoys adrift in little frequented parts of the oceans.

French Argus receivers, riding American satellites, will collect data from the balloons and buoys, determining their positions. Transoceanic airliners will carry "black boxes" automatically recording weather data on the way. Some may report their readings over earth satellite relay.

The buildup of the operational network and testing of equipment will begin in September in preparation for a year of full-fledged observations starting in September 1978. During that year there will be two "special observing periods," in January-February and May-June.

FOCUS ON THE TROPICS

These will focus on the most problematic area of the world weather picture—the tropics—and will employ the more costly devices, such as dropsondes that are to parachute down from American long-range aircraft. These will indicate wind speeds and directions at many levels over tropical latitudes in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

Virtually every country in the world is expected to participate, since ground-based observations will be made by the thousands of national weather stations integrated into the global network known as the World Weather Watch. Only the role of China remains uncertain.

The project is being organized by the World Meteorological Organization here, of which China is a member (Taiwan is not). The co-sponsor, however, is the International Council of Scientific Unions to which Taiwan still belongs and which has therefore been shunned by Peking.

The program is known as the First GARP Global Experiment. GARP is the acronym for the Global Atmospheric Research Program, started a decade ago as a long-term

effort. As stated in the prospectus of the global experiment, "The entire atmosphere of the earth and the sea surface will be observed in detail for the first time."

AFRICA-TO-BRAZIL STUDY

It is a successor to GATE, the GARP Atlantic Tropical Experiment carried out in 1974, which studied intently the region between Africa and Brazil.

Because conditions within a large part of the atmosphere, notably in the Southern Hemisphere and over tropical seas, are normally unobserved, long-range forecasts are currently imprecise or impossible. Yet there is also uncertainty as to how much would be gained by a more extensive—and costly—observing system.

It is assumed that beyond a certain time period weather becomes intrinsically indeterminate. Some suspect it may be two weeks. The global experiment seeks to find the answer by providing the huge weather center computers with two classes of information they now lack.

One is a succession of reasonably complete pictures of the state of the atmosphere at all levels and in all parts of the world during one year. The other is to derive from such observations better formulations of the rules that govern the atmosphere's behavior.

CONCERN OVER CHANGES

Because of recent concerns over climate change, an effort will be made to investigate its causes "within the limitation of a one-year period of observation."

The satellite observations will be made from four vehicles in north-south orbits and five in geosynchronous orbits, evenly spaced around the Equator. In a geosynchronous orbit, the vehicle, 22,000 miles aloft, is high enough so that its movement matches the earth's rotation and it remains above the same geographical location.

One American satellite, already in orbit, has been assigned a position above South America scanning ocean areas to either side of the Americas. Another American vehicle is over the central Pacific.

On Aug. 31 the Meteosat of the European Space Agency is to be launched to orbit over Africa. A Japanese vehicle will be placed over New Guinea, scanning the western Pacific, and in late 1978 the Soviet Union plans to place a GOMS satellite over the Indian Ocean.

These vehicles will transmit successive images of cloud cover from which wind directions at three levels of the atmosphere can be derived. This will be done two to four times daily.

SOVIET AND U.S. SATELLITES

Of the satellites in polar, or north-south, orbits, two will be of the American Tiros type and two of the Soviet Meteor system. Being only a few hundred miles aloft they will provide more detailed information on snow, ice and cloud cover as well as temperatures at various levels within the atmosphere and on sea surfaces.

The Tiros satellites will also carry the French balloon and buoy data collection and position-determining system. Some 320 constant-level balloons will be released to drift through tropical skies at a height of about 47,000 feet. They will transmit temperature data and their drift will reveal upper air winds.

They will be released from such sites as Samoa and Canton Island in the Pacific and Ascension Island in the Atlantic. The project is being organized by the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., with launchings to focus on the two Special Observing Periods.

It is also during those periods that the buoys are to be deployed in the region between 20 and 65 degrees south latitude. They are designed to fill in the largest gap of all—

the vast oceanic area surrounding Antarctica. Ships supplying bases on that continent will be among those launching the buoys, 100 of which are to be furnished by Canada, plus 200 from other countries.

Ships of participating nations at least twice daily will release balloons to ascend through the atmosphere reporting weather data.

The tropics are the focus of special efforts, not only because they are poorly observed but also because small-scale phenomena there seems to play an important role, providing most of the energy for atmospheric circulation.

STEVE EDNEY—MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1977, the Maritime Trades Department of the Southern California Ports Council, AFL-CIO, will honor a man whose assertive leadership has been instrumental in making organized labor a strong force in the harbor community. As president of the United Cannery and Industrial Workers of the Pacific, Steve Edney has worked tirelessly through the years for the working men and women who belong to his organization, and has also been active in expanding the scope of organized labor in the maritime world.

Currently, the tuna industry finds itself in a difficult situation due to Government regulations restricting fishing operations by American vessels. Steve has been extremely active in trying to resolve this situation, which has adversely affected the employment security of many members of his union who work in the major fish canneries in my district on Terminal Island.

This is just one example of the concern Steve Edney has always demonstrated, as well as the direct action he is willing to take on behalf of the men and women he represents. His efforts to save the jobs of cannery workers in this and other situations are just a sample of the reasons he will be honored by organized labor and the Los Angeles-Long Beach harbor community.

Born on January 10, 1917, Steve Edney first worked in the canneries in 1945. He became a shop steward in the Pan Pacific Cannery on Terminal Island, and his natural leadership ability and interest in helping people soon moved him up the ranks.

After serving as health and welfare director, chairman of the shop steward council, and business agent and vice president of the United Cannery and Industrial Workers of the Pacific, Steve was elected president of the union in 1965. His performance in this job has been marked by total devotion to his duties, and an openness and accessibility to the rank-and-file members of his union.

Steve has been involved in organized labor activities to a very large degree. Currently vice president of the California State Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, he is also vice president of the Seafarers' International Union of North America. In addition, he serves as chairman of the Fisheries and Cannery Workers Conference.

He has been active in community and civic affairs as well. A former president of the Los Angeles harbor chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP—Steve has also served on the board of directors of the Young Men's Christian Association. He is currently vice chairman of Los Angeles mayor Tom Bradley's city economic committee, and also serves on the mayor's welfare planning council.

Mr. Speaker, few individuals have deserved the title of "Organized Labor Man of the Year" as Steve Edney has this year. His leadership and ability have not only benefited the working men and women who belong to the United Cannery and Industrial Workers of the Pacific, but have helped improve the Los Angeles-Long Beach harbor area as a place in which to live and work.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Steve as he receives this award, and in wishing him continued success and good fortune in the years to come. We are positive that his lovely wife, Alberta, and son, Henry, must be justly proud of Steve as his many achievements are recognized by his peers in organized labor.

SENATE—Friday, May 27, 1977

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 18, 1977)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, our Father, help us to learn the lessons that life is teaching us. Save us from multiplying our mistakes, from repeatedly yielding to the same temptations, from refusing to see our own faults, from concealing our bad judgment, from harboring resentment and ill will—until personality is blemished and the Creator's image is effaced.

Keep us close to Thee, O Lord, and close to the people we serve. Help us daily to grow stronger, purer, kinder, to shed old faults and to gain new virtues, until, by Thy grace, life becomes altogether new. By becoming better help us to make a better world.

Be with us in our coming in and our going out, now and forever. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1977.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MATSUNAGA thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Thursday, May 26, 1977, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe we got an order yesterday authorizing all committees to meet during the session of the Senate today, did we not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, we did.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have nothing more at this time.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

DECISION BY JUDGE RICHARD OWEN REGARDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR STRIKERS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a few days ago, I offered an amendment to S. 275, the Food and Agriculture Act, which would have made strikers ineligible to receive food stamps. By a vote of 38 to 56, the Senate tabled that amendment. That action was a disappointment not only to me, but more importantly, to everyone who believes that our programs of public assistance must be limited to the truly needy.

This issue will come back to haunt us again. The Federal Government and the States are reaching the end of their ropes in terms of the financial resources they can afford to allot for welfare programs. Every food stamp dollar gobbled up by strikers, with the consent of the Congress, is a dollar taken away from the poor, the hungry, the destitute elderly, and needy children. Giving food stamps to strikers might be good politics, for some, but it is not good government. In my mind, it breaks faith with both the